UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2491st MEETING: 27 OCTOBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2491)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Grenada: Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2491st MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 27 October 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Abdullah SALAH (Jordan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2491)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Grenada:
   Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067)

The meeting was called to order at 5.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Grenada:
Letter dated 25 October 1983 from the Deputy Minister for External Relations of Nicaragua addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16067)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with decisions taken by the Council at its 2487th and 2489th meetings, I invite the representative of Grenada to take a place at the Council table, and I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Dominica, Ethiopia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mozambique, Nigeria, Saint Lucia, Seychelles, the Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela and Viet Nam to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Jacobs (Grenada) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Jacobs (Antigua and Barbuda), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Gumucio Granier (Bolivia), Mr. Roa Kourí (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Baron (Dominica), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Richardson (Jamaica), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), Mr. St. Aimee (Saint Lucia), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela) and Mr. Hoang Bich Son (Viet Nam) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The representative of the United States of America has asked to speak on a point of order, and I now call upon him.

3. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): I rise to a point of order. It is my understanding that you, Mr. President, are in possession of a communication addressed to you yesterday by the Governor-General of Grenada, the Honourable Sir Paul Scoon, which raises in my mind a question as to whether the gentleman now seated at this table with the designation "Grenada" is properly seated as a representative of the Government of Grenada.

4. I would further suggest, or request, that it might be useful in these circumstances, if my understanding is correct as to the communication from the Governor-General, to seek a report from the Secretary-General on this question.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The representative of the United States of America has raised an objection to the credentials of the representative of Grenada and questioned whether he is entitled to take the place reserved for Grenada.

6. I believe the communication, which arrived at noon today and which will be distributed to members of the Council, should properly be directed to the Secretary-General, since he is the person concerned with the question of credentials. It was, however, addressed to the President of the Security Council. Nevertheless, there are certain questions concerning its authenticity, and the matter is still under consultation between the Secretary-General and myself. I shall distribute it to members of the Council when I have received the Secretary-General's comments on it. I propose, therefore, to suspend this meeting for a short while.

The meeting was suspended at 5.20 p.m. and resumed at 6.45 p.m.

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Secretary-General will in due course prepare a report on the point of order that was raised by the representative of the United States at the beginning of this meeting.

8. I would inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Benin, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, the German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Mongolia, Peru, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Sri Lanka, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ogouma (Benin), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. da Luz (Cape Verde), Mr. Albán-Holguín (Colombia), Mr. Murín (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Knipping Victoria (Dominican Republic), Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Quiñones-Amézquita (Guatemala), Mr. Semedo (Guinea-Bissau), Mr. Hollai (Hungary), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia), Mr. Arias Stella (Peru), Mr. Toney (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines), Mr. Cassandra (Sao Tome and Principe), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. Alleyne (Trinidad and Tobago), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that as President I have received a letter dated 27 October 1983 from the representative of Jordan which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request that the Security Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, during its consideration of the item 'The situation in Grenada'".

That letter has been published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/16091. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 to Mr. Maksoud.

10. The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda. Members of the Council have before them document S/16077/Rev.1, which contains the text of a revised draft resolution submitted by Guyana, Nicaragua and Zimbabwe. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following documents: S/16078, letter dated 26 October 1983, from the representative of India to the President of the Security Council; S/16084, letter dated 26 October, from the representative of Brazil to the President of the Council; S/16086, letter dated 26 October, from the representative of Yugoslavia to the Council President; and S/16090, letter dated 25 October, from the representative of Belize to the Council President.

11. The first speaker is the representative of Saint Lucia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

12. Mr. St. AIMEE (Saint Lucia): I wish to thank the Council, through you, Mr. President, for this opportunity to make a statement on behalf of the Government and people of Saint Lucia regarding the item under consideration—the situation in Grenada. Allow me also to congratulate you as you take the helm of this very important body of the Organization.

13. The Prime Minister of Dominica has presented the position of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), of which Saint Lucia is a member, but I hope to be able to clear up some aspects for the members here.

14. The Government of Saint Lucia agreed to participate in a multinational force to remove what it deemed a threat to its security. The Charter of the United Nations recognizes the right of any and every country to take these measures, under Article 51, providing mechanisms also for the removal of these threats. We do not know of any State which has called for removal of this Article. Why? Because now, as when the Charter was drafted, this Article has its purpose.

15. My delegation listened to the many statements made yesterday before the Council [*2489th meeting*] and is glad that there is agreement on a number of issues: first, that there existed a situation of uncertainty, a breakdown of law and order, and a lack of information on the issues in Grenada; secondly, that the objectives and hopes of all here are for a return to normalcy in Grenada; and thirdly, that all countries have the right to self-determination and territorial security.

16. The areas of contention and disagreement are simply, then, first: when is a country to defend itself and how does it choose to defend itself; secondly, who determines what is a threat to the security of a State; and, thirdly, who acts in the name of the people—in this case, the people of Grenada, in whose name we have already heard many representatives speak here?

17. My delegation is therefore convinced that once the facts are known and understood, much light will have been shed on the situation.

18. The peoples of the eastern Caribbean are one. We share a common culture, a common heritage, a common language, and we have developed common institutions of Government, always with the sole purpose of attaining the improvement of the welfare and well-being of our citizens. We have, to a great extent, been very successful, since not one of us, in spite of our small size and lack of natural resources, is included in the list of least developed countries. This has been possible because of our close interrelationship and co-operation with one another.

19. We were therefore very saddened to hear some representatives attempt to belittle our subregional organization, the OECS, giving the impression that we could not devise an organization to enhance the well-being of our people.

To those who do not have a history of co-operation, this may be very difficult to understand. But to us who are one, it is very easy. The fact remains that we are one people, and we will always be one people, and that what affects one of us affects all of us. To prove the extent of that co-operation, may I inform the members here that most of us in the OECS share a joint representative in London and in Ottawa who, pursuant to the Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, can speak for any one of us. That was a very important political decision. It was under the terms of that same treaty that my Government agreed to participate in a multinational force.

20. In 1979 a series of events began in Grenada, our sister island, which needs some restating here. Members of the New Jewel Movement under Maurice Bishop removed the administration of Eric Gairy. While a number of Caribbean States expressed their displeasure at the method, it must be recognized that not one intervened because the administration of Mr. Gairy did not solicit our assistance. It must be pointed out also that attempts to isolate the Government of Prime Minister Bishop were met with resistance by the member States of our subregion, in clear recognition that the people of Grenada wanted and supported that Government. Yet we were, and have been, apprehensive about the buildup of military troops on Grenada and we did, on many occasions, express this concern to the Government of Grenada. The massive buildup of military troops is foreign to our part of the region, and we rightly had to be concerned about it. But we were also, and on many occasions, assured—indeed we felt assured then and we had reason to believe—that those troops would not be used against States in our region by Mr. Bishop's Government. That assurance was given to us by Mr. Bishop.

21. A dramatic turn of events occurred in the past two weeks. Mr. Bishop and a number of his Cabinet members were killed. The whereabouts of many others are not known. That element of assurance which we had from Mr. Bishop was no more. It was removed.

22. But let us go back to the immediate events leading to Mr. Bishop's death. We confirmed, and everyone here agrees, that Prime Minister Bishop was placed under house arrest. We know, and so do the members of the Council, that the people of Grenada freed their Prime Minister. He was subsequently brutally murdered. Who did it? Surely it cannot be the same people who freed him. We must look for somebody else. Our information confirmed that there is growing military personnel on the island of Grenada and that military personnel, in collusion with some elements—and I would not wish to use a word here that I heard used some time ago by a representative of a member State in referring to Governments and people—imprisoned the entire population, the very people, by imposing a 24-hour curfew with orders to shoot on sight. Surely, a people would not act in its own name and then put out an order to shoot itself on sight. We have therefore, to look for elements of that order from somewhere else.

23. It was the Governor-General of Grenada—and I repeat, the Governor-General of Grenada—in whom executive authority in Grenada rests under Section 57 of the Grenada Constitution, although, of course, he may delegate that authority to a subordinate office—and I might add, where that subordinate office exists, if it exists. It was the Governor-General who made a formal request to the OECS, of which Grenada is a member, for assistance to remove what he saw as a threat to his people and what at that stage had also become a threat to our subregion.

24. While addressing the Council yesterday the representative of Guyana, our partner in the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), wise in the ways of our political institutions, told members that the Governor-General is the legal authority in Grenada. In his statement to the non-aligned meeting he noted that his Government had accepted that the Governor-General could be a point of contact with Caribbean countries. My delegation therefore fails to understand why some representatives here refuse to consider the legitimacy and authority of the Governor-General to request assistance from any quarter to defend and remove what he sees as a threat to his people. Such a request is also in keeping with the provisions of both the charter of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and the Charter of the United Nations. And, I must add, we have many examples of that kind of request all around the world.

25. We must also understand the concern and intention of the Governor-General for the safety of his citizens and also acknowledge the right of States within the region to be concerned about their own safety and security. Once we do that we cannot but determine that the situation that developed in Grenada over the past two weeks constituted a threat to peace in the region.

26. Why did the OECS think that their security was threatened? Let us look at another set of facts. During his first address to the Council [*2487th meeting*], the representative of Cuba informed the Council that the Cuban "workers" on Grenada had been given an opportunity very early in the proceedings not to become involved in what was happening. What was their decision? They opted to fight. What were they fighting and who were they fighting for? Later on, we heard such words used as "defending the Fatherland". Whose Fatherland? Which Fatherland? Had Grenada then become part of Cuba? Did they feel obliged to defend Grenada as Grenada or Grenada as part of Cuba? I am sure the question is clear. The answer to it is also clear.

27. We, too, in Saint Lucia have had occasion to get foreign assistance in the construction of our international airport, but never at any time were there more than 30 to 40 Canadian and British technicians on the project. I am not trained in engineering or military tactics, so how 500 ordinary workers opt to fight in Grenada and defend themselves so valiantly, as we were told by the representative of Cuba, is beyond my comprehension. What was the cause? What justifies the blood of a people with no ties whatsoever, barely understanding each other because of language and other barriers, being shed on Grenadian soil in defence of interests alien to the people of Grenada?

28. The representative of Mexico mentioned in his statement [*ibid.*] that some States were attempting to impose

their political models on others. We in the OECS—and the representative and spokesman of Grenada confirmed this—have accepted the principle of ideological pluralism within our subregion. But let us be clear. When one State, by virtue of the presence of its armed forces within another State, prevents the people from exercing their franchise and legitimate right to choose whatever institution of Government they want, it must be considered as interference. Such was the situation existing in Grenada on or about 18 October—not 25 October. That interference in and invasion of Grenada had taken place long before and not by us. Given our military weakness, and correctly assessing the intentions and objectives of a State which has been involved in Grenada and which has been accused of interference in the affairs of States much stronger than we are, the Defence and Security Committee of the OECS decided to seek assistance to combat a threat to the security of its members and to respond to a request by a legal authority in Grenada, a member of the organization, to remove a threat from within. It is in this light that the events of 26 October must be seen, and only in this light.

29. The Prime Minister of Dominica, Chairperson of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, has outlined the plans of the Governor-General for an interim Government and subsequent holding of free and fair elections in the State [*2489th meeting*]. We at least owe it to him to give him a chance to carry out his duty within an international environment of understanding and assistance, not one of hostility. The decision of the Council can go a long way to creating this environment conducive to peace and harmony and can assist the people of Grenada to live again with hope after their long ordeal of over two weeks. They have lost their cherished leader, let them now not lose hope in this great Organization of ours.

30. Mr. MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe): Mr. President, I wish to express my personal appreciation for the prompt response you gave to Nicaragua's request for the convening of the Council to consider the situation in Grenada. As members know, my delegation was among those which supported this request for an immediate meeting. We did so out of our concern about the current developments in that country.

31. The Prime Minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe, Mr. Robert Mugabe, on several occasions has expressed deep concern and anxiety about the dangerous situation in the Caribbean and Central American regions. Recently, at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi in March, he made the following pertinent observation:

> "The continued tension in the Central American, the Caribbean and the South Atlantic regions, is largely a direct result of foreign intervention, most of which is aimed at destabilizing and undermining the progressive governments in those areas."

Similar observations were made by Zimbabwe's Minister for Foreign Affairs in his address at the 29th meeting of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, on 12 October 1983.

32. We are meeting today because Grenada, one of the smallest nations in the world, has been invaded by the most powerful and richest country in the world. Grenada's territorial integrity has been rudely violated, and its political independence and national sovereignty are gravely at stake. This is the price the people of that peace-loving State are paying for espousing a political philosophy which does not meet with the approval of some of their neighbours.

33. Let there be no mistake, the people of Grenada earned the wrath and hostility of their most powerful neighbours because they opted for and pursued truly independent and progressive domestic and foreign policies, compatible with their chosen political philosophy. In particular, Grenada's neighbours have been offended by its choice of friends and allies, and they made no secret of this. It had become increasingly clear that sooner or later the slightest excuse or pretext would be used to intervene directly in the internal affairs of Grenada—and indeed of any of the other progressive democratic nations in that region. The deteriorating situation in Grenada in recent weeks which led to the tragic and untimely death of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and some of his colleagues provided that pretext and opportunity. In fact the international community is now left to wonder whether those now fishing in the muddy and murky waters in and around Grenada are mere beneficiaries of that situation or are its creators.

34. The invasion of Grenada on the morning of 25 October by so-called multinational forces was executed for the sole purpose of overthrowing the Government of that country, in order to replace it with a puppet régime. The invasion is very much in line with the policy of perceiving the world in terms of spheres of influence. A genuinely independent Grenada in the middle of what is generally regarded as a certain Power's sphere of influence, or back yard, was unfortunately perceived as a threat to the interests of that Power.

35. We have said time and again, in this Council and in other forums, that we in Zimbabwe are strongly opposed to any Power's arrogating to itself the right to decide for other countries what type of Government they must have or, for that matter, who should lead them. The choosing of a Government and of leadership is the sovereign prerogative of the people of each country and must be exercised without external interference and influence.

36. We also wish to point out that the invasion of Grenada, which was masterminded, planned, financed and executed by a super-Power and a permanent member of this Council, is a shameless breach of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the General Assembly's Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.[1] For instance, Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter, which all Member States are required to observe scrupulously, states very clearly:

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territor-

ial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

Unless all Member States—large and small, super-Powers or non-super-Powers—respect those principles, humanity might as well abandon altogether any notion of organized and civilized international relations and return to the jungle.

37. The reckless breaching of the bedrock principles of international law and the corner-stones on which civilized international order is founded, such as occurred on 25 October against Grenada, gives rise to very deep concerns among peoples living in regions and areas which are being regarded as other people's so-called spheres of influence or back yards—that is, Central America, southern Africa and the Middle East. Any of those regions may for similar reasons qualify for military intervention by some strong Powers.

38. There are no circumstances according to the Charter and international law governing inter-State relations in which military intervention in or invasion of another State is permitted. The reasons adduced in a vain attempt to justify the invasion of Grenada must therefore be categorically rejected. At no time did Grenada pose a threat to the security of its neighbours, within the Caribbean region or outside it. Who, for example, can take seriously the claim that Grenada, with a population small enough to be seated in one sports stadium in this country, could threaten the security of a nuclear Power? Nor can we accept the assertion that citizens of some other country residing in Grenada were in danger. We have also been told that after the death of Prime Minister Bishop and some of his colleagues there existed an unacceptable power vacuum in Grenada. Again, this is not borne out by facts. Even supposing that were the case, we do not accept that it is the duty of outsiders to choose a Government for Grenada.

39. What, then, should the Council do? It has a responsibility to condemn the invasion in the strongest possible terms and to tell the perpetrators that their presence in Grenada is illegal and that the only legal thing which they can do now is to withdraw from that country, forthwith and unconditionally. When the invasion has been stopped, the Council should do everything possible to assist Grenada to restore and secure its territorial integrity, political independence and national sovereignty, free from all forms of undue external interference, pressure and influence. In no circumstances should Grenada's sovereignty and non-aligned status be compromised. The perpetrators of the shameless act of naked aggression against Grenada should be required to pay reparations to that country.

40. We believe the draft resolution before the Council [*S/16077/Rev.1*] offers the necessary first steps towards the accomplishment of the goal which we have outlined. Accordingly we urge all Council members to support it. Such action will eloquently demonstrate the Council's unanimous sense of revulsion at this crime against international peace and security. This is the least the Council can be expected to do for the struggling people of Grenada.

41. Lastly, the people of Grenada can count on Zimbabwe's full support and solidarity with them in their struggle to be genuinely free, independent and non-aligned.

42. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Ecuador. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

43. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to thank you, Sir, and the other members of the Council for providing me this opportunity to speak in the Security Council on a subject of broad significance to the United Nations and of particular importance to the Latin American region.

44. First of all, I should like to express the condolences of my Government on the tragic death of the Prime Minister of Grenada, Mr. Maurice Bishop, and of members of his Government, as well as our sorrow at the other victims of the recent succession of lamentable events that have occurred in that fraternal country.

45. In that respect, the Government of Ecuador issued the following statement on 25 October:

"The Government of Ecuador is a faithful defender of the principles of international coexistence enshrined in the charters of the United Nations and of the Organization of American States, particularly the prohibition of the use of force in international relations, respect for the sovereign equality of States and their territorial integrity, non-intervention of whatever sort in their internal and external affairs and the self-determination of peoples. It condemns the armed action carried out today against Grenada, an action that has aggravated the already troubled situation in the Caribbean, about which the Government of Ecuador has frequently expressed its concern.

"We therefore appeal urgently for an end to the foreign intervention and for the establishment of the conditions necessary to enable the people of Grenada to exercise their sovereign right freely to elect their democratic Government."

46. Defence of the principle of the non-use of force or threat of force in international relations has been a part of the history of Ecuador since it attained political independence at the beginning of the last century. In this spirit, my country contributed to the drafting of the Charter of the United Nations, in which all Member States undertook to settle international disputes by peaceful means that would not endanger either international peace and security or justice. Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter states, as Members are aware:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

47. This is the universal law which must prevail over any dialectics or particular policy if we wish to live in an international community founded on the rule of law. Moreover, Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter states that not even the United Nations is authorized to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. Therefore, Ecuador feels that even the remotest recourse to force in an attempt to impose conditions on any country whatsoever is contrary to law and to the civilized course of history.

48. Moreover, aware of the importance of the principle of faith in the equal rights of nations large and small, and espousing a coherent and uniform attitude that must remain consistent in all situations, Ecuador will continue in United Nations debates to uphold the absolute need for the withdrawal of foreign occupation troops anywhere in the world, whether in Africa, Asia, the Middle East or the Mediterranean, or in Central America, the Caribbean or any other part of our hemisphere. Such is the indispensable prerequisite for peoples, through free elections, to be able to choose their own destiny free from the armed pressure of foreign forces.

49. With an equal moral authority, we reiterate that position in this instance, because unswerving adherence to principles proves to be the sole source of strength on which countries, particularly those that lack military, economic or technological power, can rely.

50. The delegation of Ecuador trusts that the action of the Security Council will lead to the immediate withdrawal of foreign forces from the sovereign territory of Grenada and that it will prove possible to create the conditions necessary to arrive at a solution to the serious situation that has prompted the present debate.

51. Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (United States of America): Some of the speakers before the Council in the past few days have attempted to present the events of the past days as a classical invasion of a small country by an imperial Power, a simple case of intervention in the internal affairs of others, a case whose moral and legal character is readily discernible. After all, the Charter of the United Nations forbids the use of force to settle a dispute, and force has been used by the task force. The Charter forbids intervention in the internal affairs of States, and the task force is intervening in the affairs of Grenada. The Charter requires respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, and when foreign forces land on an island it might not—at first glance—appear unreasonable to contend that the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the State is not being fully respected. That, as I understand it, is the purport of the draft resolution now circulating in the Council. That is the reasoning urged on the Council by an interesting array of speakers. It is, presummably the reasoning that will lead Council members—at least some of those members—to support the draft resolution.

52. It is a particular perspective. The perspective I have described begins with the landing of the task force in Grenada, the day before yesterday. It treats the prohibition against the use of force in the Charter as an absolute, and the injunction against intervention in the internal affairs of other States as the only obligation of States under the Charter.

53. The events of the past days pose no such morally or legally simple questions as has been suggested by that interesting array of speakers. The prohibitions against the use of force in the Charter are contextual, not absolute. They provide justification for the use of force against force in pursuit of other values also inscribed in the Charter, such values as freedom, democracy, peace. The Charter does not require that peoples submit supinely to terror, nor that their neighbours be indifferent to their terrorization. the events in the Caribbean do not comprise a classical example of a large Power invading a small, helpless nation.

54. The impression that there is involved here a violation of the Charter which should be straightforwardly condemned by an outraged world opinion is not only a delusion, it is as well a snare, a snare which will leave those caught within it a bit weaker, a bit more confused, a bit less able to defend themselves, a bit more of what Jean-François Revel called in his most recent book, *Comment les démocraties finissent*, an obliging victim. This is another way of saying that although the islands that we are meeting to discuss are small, the issues are as large as any ever discussed in this chamber.

55. The use of force is indeed central to our deliberations, as is respect of the rights of people to self-determination, as is non-intervention in the internal affairs of others. The most fundamental questions of legitimacy, human rights and self-defence are also present in this debate in this chamber.

56. The intrusion of force into the public life of Grenada did not begin with the landing of a task force. Before 1979 Grenada was ruled by a corrupt Government. From 1979 Grenada had been ruled by a Government which came to power by *coup*, overthrowing that corrupt predecessor. That new Government declined to submit itself to free elections. That Government itself succumbed to superior force more than two weeks ago when, with the complicity of certain Powers, which have in the past three days nearly drowned us in crocodile tears over the death of Maurice Bishop and foreign intervention in Grenada's affairs, first arrested, then murdered, Bishop and his ministers. Thus began what can only be called an authentic reign of terror in Grenada.

57. Tragically then, for them, the people of Grenada had already had large experience with political violence before the arrival of the task force. The people of Grenada were also sadly accustomed to foreign intervention in their internal affairs. Let us speak frankly about this situation. Maurice Bishop was a man with strong ideological commitments. Those commitments identified him and allied him with Cuba, the Soviet Union and the member States of that empire which invokes Marxist principles to justify tyranny. Maurice Bishop freely offered his island as a base for the projection of Soviet military power in this hemisphere.

58. The familiar pattern of militarization and Cubanization was already far advanced in Grenada. More than three dozen Soviet officials have been detained in just the past three days. An enormous, truly enormous, arsenal of Soviet weapons has been come across in the last three days. The total number of Cubans present on Grenada is still unknown, but it appears likely that there were over 1,000, more than one Cuban for every 100 Grenadians.

59. Even this did not satisfy Prime Minister Bishop's friends. Maurice Bishop was not the victim of an ordinary power struggle. As Jamaica's Prime Minister Seaga put it:

> "It became clear, as events unfolded, that this was a well-planned and orchestrated *coup* which was carried out with a savagery and brutality without precedent in the English-speaking Caribbean. On Wednesday, 19 October, after having been released by a large crowd of his supporters, Mr. Bishop, his Minister of Education Miss Jaqueline Creft, his Foreign Minister Mr. Unison Whiteman, Mr. Norris Bain, Minister of Housing, Mr. Vincent Noel, leader of the Bank and General Workers Union, Mr. Fitzroy Bain, another trade union leader, were brutally executed by Cuban-trained military officers who had seized power. We also learned subsequently that the People's Revolutionary Army had fired on a crowd of demonstrators which included many women and children and that several of these have not been accounted for and are presumed to have been killed. An eyewitness reports having seen a child attempting to jump to safety having his legs blown off."

60. Let us be clear in this Chamber tonight. Grenada's internal affairs had fallen under the permanent intervention of one neighbouring and one remote tyranny. Its people were helpless in the grip of terror. Imagine, if you will, that here in New York, tonight, just after we return home, some gunmen, who had already proved that they would kill on a whim, announced that anyone leaving his home, anyone appearing on the streets, would be shot on sight. Imagine, if you will, that that condition lasted for four days and four nights, punctuated by the sound of gunshot. Ask yourself whether friendly forces arriving to free us from some nearby democratic country would be engaged in a violation of the Charter in an unjustifiable intervention in United States internal affairs, in an unjustified use of force.

61. Listen to the comments of the Prime Minister of Barbados:

> "The pros and cons of the action of the Caribbean Governments will be long debated. So will those of President Reagan in coming to our aid. But I think that history will agree with the verdict of public opinion in the eastern Caribbean. There has seldom been in these islands such virtual unanimous support in the media, and at political and popular levels, for an action so potentially divisive. West Indians have shown that we have a view of our future that is democratic, peace-loving and devoted to constitutional and not arbitrary government. We have shown that we can cut through the sometimes artificial controversies, generated by today's media, and go right to the heart of things, what is best for our people. The United States and President Reagan have, to their eternal credit, concurred in our views and have come to the same conclusion as we have."

62. I know, as well as the Council knows, that such words may easily be dismissed as cynical. After all, are we not all accustomed to similar justifications as when the Soviet Union invades Afghanistan or imposes a new Government on the people of Poland, or when Viet Nam invades and occupies Cambodia? Why should anyone here suppose that this is not just one more cynical claim when we assert that the task force, of which we are members, is there to restore self-determination to the people of Grenada rather than to deny them self-determination.

63. There is an easy test: the test is what comes after. We intend—we in the task force—as all of us have now made clear, to leave Grenada just as soon as law is restored and the instruments of self-government—democratic government—have been put in place. But all Governments in our time claim to be democratic. They all say they are going to leave as soon as law is restored. What will there be to support the claim that the new Government of Grenada will be any more an authentic expression of the will of the people of Grenada than was the gang of thugs from whom Grenada has just been delivered? Again, the answer is easy. There is a simple test. It will be clear that self-government has been restored to Grenada because freedom and the institutions through which free peoples express themselves will be clearly in evidence: a free press, free trade unions, free elections and representative, responsible government.

64. It should not be difficult for any people, especially any democratic people which has ever suffered a reign of terror from foreign or domestic tyrants, to discern the difference between the force that liberates captive peoples from terror and the force that imposes terror on captive peoples. Neither the intellectual nor the moral nor the legal problems involved here are really very difficult.

65. Because of the repeated discussions and questions here in this chamber concerning the legal bases of this intervention, I should like to address my attention now, briefly, once again to this matter of the legal foundation for United States action in Grenada. It was indeed a unique combination of circumstances prevailing in Grenada that led the United States to respond positively to the OECS request that we assist it in its decision to undertake collective action to secure peace and stability in the Caribbean region. Those circumstances included danger to innocent United States nationals, the absence of a minimally responsible Government in Grenada and the danger posed to the OECS by the relatively awesome military might that those responsible for the murder of the Bishop Government now had at their disposal. The United States' response, we believe, was fully compatible with relevant international law and practice. I will turn briefly to each of these points.

66. I deal first with the defence of innocent nationals. The United States' concern for the safety of its nationals was real and compelling and had absolutely nothing to do with any inclination to gunboat diplomacy. As Prime Minister Seaga pointed out in his address to Jamaica's parliament on 25 October, "madmen" wiped out the whole Government of Grenada, murdered its leading citizens and imposed a 24-hour shoot-on-sight curfew against its own citizenry. The madmen responsible for the *coup* in Grenada did not put their captured adversaries on trial. They simply murdered them in cold blood. In these circumstances it was fully reasonable for the United States to conclude that these madmen might decide at any moment to hold hostage the 1,000 American citizens on that island.

67. American nationals scattered throughout the island were denied the right of free exit, as students returning last night testified repeatedly. The airport was closed and entry by humanitarian organizations and others concerned with their welfare was prevented. The United States, having recently been victim of, as well as witness to, revolutionary violence in Iran, where, in contravention of all international conventions and the express ruling of the International Court of Justice, United States diplomatic personnel were held hostage, could not be expected to sit idly by while the lives of a thousand of our citizens were again threatened.

68. Of course, it goes without saying that the United States does not advocate that in normal circumstances concern for the safety of a State's nationals in a foreign country may justify military measures against that country. But normal circumstances presuppose the existence of a Government which, regardless of its democratic, non-democratic or anti-democratic nature, or the system which it pursues, is nevertheless recognized as minimally responsible for not wantonly endangering the lives of its citizens and foreign nationals and the security of neighbouring States in the region. Where, however, terrorists murder the leading citizenry and leadership of their own country, a situation may well arise in which no new Government replaces the former order, but anarchy prevails. In those circumstances, the general rule of international law permits military action to project endangered nationals.

69. The second point that I should like to address briefly is that this was indeed a unique situation, in which there existed a vacuum of responsible governmental authority. The revulsion shared by the international community over the cold-blooded murder of Mr. Bishop's Government was nearly universal. The consequences of the *coup* were not, however, restricted to Grenada. Although a small island, Grenada, because of its massive buildup of arms and materiël, had become capable of gravely affecting the security of the entire Caribbean region. Those most immediately affected by the situation prevailing in Grenada were, of course, Grenada's neighbouring countries, all of which were members of the OECS, the Caribbean regional organization. As they were aware that terrorists were in control of Grenada, it became incumbent upon the States of the OECS to assess the military capability at their disposal and the dangers presented to the security of all the States in the Caribbean region.

70. In assessing this danger, the States of the OECS, most of which, as we have heard here, have no army at all or have armies of fewer than 200 men, concluded that the military potential of Grenada in the hands of the madmen who engineered the *coup* had reached threatening proportions. For example, although Jamaica's population exceeds by twentyfold that of Grenada, Grenada's army—its known army, its indigenous army—exceeded by one and a half times the size of Jamaica's armed forces. Moreover, a new airstrip was in the final stages of completion by over 600 armed Cubans. In the words of Jamaica's Prime Minister Seaga:

> "In the hands of sane men, [the airstrip] would have offered no threat, but against the background of the insanity of the past two weeks it would be a logical staging area for countries whose interests are similar and who have ambitions for using Grenada as a centre for subversion, sabotage and infiltration within the area and against member States of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States."

71. It was in this context that the OECS, viewing with the greatest alarm this combination of brutal men and awesome might, decided to undertake collective action pursuant to its charter. Such action fully accorded with relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, which accorded regional organizations the authority to undertake collection action.

72. When asked to assist this effort, the United States, whose own nationals and vital interests were independently affected, joined the effort to restore minimal conditions of law and order in Grenada and to eliminate the threat posed to the security of the entire region.

73. The third legal point which I should like to address briefly concerns collective regional action. Dominica, Barbados, Jamaica and other Caribbean States have already made clear the factors that impelled them to invoke their regional treaty arrangements for collective action. As pointed out by their representatives here, the issue was not revolution. This hemisphere has seen many revolutions and many members of the OECS, like the United States itself, were born of revolution. Each of us in this hemisphere celebrates an independence day. Nor was it an issue of the type of Government Grenada possessed.

74. While the Government of Maurice Bishop, which had never secured a mandate from its electorate, was an anomaly, and an unwelcome anomaly, in the democratic Caribbean Sea, no thought was ever given by the OECS to influencing a change of that Government. No effort, may I add, was ever undertaken by the United States to affect in any way the composition or character of that Government. Rather, the OECS was spurred to action because, as a result of the murder of Mr. Bishop and almost his entire Cabinet, the military power which Grenada had amassed with Cuban and Soviet backing had fallen into the hands of individuals who could be reasonably expected to wield that awesome power against its neighbours. That the *coup* leaders had no arguable claim to being the responsible Government was indeed made clear by their own declara-

tions, the failure of other States to recognize them as a legitimate Government and the fact that the Governor General of Grenada, the sole remaining symbol of governmental authority on the island, invited OECS action.

75. In the context of these very particular, very unusual and conceivably unique circumstances, the United States decided to accede to the request of the OECS to aid its collective efforts aimed at securing peace and stability in the Caribbean region.

76. I should like to close by once again quoting Prime Minister Seaga, who, I believe, has given perhaps the best justification of the decision by Jamaica and the United States to accede to the request of the OECS for assistance in its effort to establish collective security for the region. Prime Minister Seaga said:

> "It is the inescapable fact that revolution breeds revolution because it makes no allowance to institutionalize opposition and to change administrations peacefully. During the past week we witnessed in Grenada not only a revolution spawning its own destruction, but a brutal military takeover of a civilian Government.
>
> "It may be felt that these matters do not concern us, but most certainly they do. If a whole Government can be wiped out overnight, by either political or military extremists and the Governments of the Caribbean remain silent and passive, then no Government elected by the people can be safe from madmen of one type or another who would seek to replace a Government of the people, elected by the people, with one selected by whichever chosen few of whatever nature.
>
> "If we ignored the occurrence of brutal military takeovers or political overthrows of Government, we would immediately give heart to every subversive group within the region to engineer disorder and instability as a means of overthrow. No democratic system of government would have a chance of carrying out the programmes of development which it was elected to implement if in its midst was a group of subversives, anarchists and terrorists bent on destruction of the foundations of stability which underpin the whole system of democracy. The far-reaching consequences of such neglect on our part would be awesome and would have the effect of creating an unsure and an insecure future for all of us.
>
> "For the sake of the democratic system of government which we all agree to be the one which allows the maximum freedom of choice to peoples and protects their right to elect a government of their choice, we cannot ignore the events which defeat these purposes whenever they occur in the English-speaking Caribbean."

77. It behoves this Council, as well as the English-speaking Caribbean, not to ignore events which defeat the purposes for which this Organization was founded. Those purposes are the promotion of human freedom, human rights and self-determination, the protection of national independence and the promotion of development. The Council is not incapable of making distinctions between policies which serve those purposes and policies which undermine them. No Government in this chamber is incapable of making such distinctions. We very much hope that those Governments in this chamber which do indeed endorse and support the principles of the Charter of the United Nations will reflect carefully on the most profound and important issues involved here.

78. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Once again, regrettably, the Security Council is called upon to consider a most serious situation, in which the use of armed forces has been adopted as a means to achieve defined ends. Malta views with extreme dismay and concern all instances of foreign intervention, especially armed intervention, in the internal affairs of any States.

79. Our consternation becomes all the more acute in the light of a situation in which, as in the case of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979, a super-Power—this time the United States of America—becomes directly involved. The implications for regional and global peace and security which arise in the wake of any such involvement impose unacceptable dangers on all members of the international community.

80. Armed intervention has taken place in Grenada. That is an action which Malta strongly deplores. All the arguments which have been adduced in justification of that action, despite their sophistication, fail to dispel our sincere misgivings that a very serious and deliberate violation of the basic norms which govern relations between sovereign and independent States has occurred.

81. Only a few weeks ago my country's Foreign Minister, in his statement at the 23rd meeting of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, underlined the threat to State sovereignty which resides in the unrestrained scramble for global power and influence over men and resources which increasingly and most unfortunately we are witnessing. We simply cannot accept that the precarious international political environment in which we are living can serve as a justification for any action which somehow evades or diminishes the responsibility to seek peaceful resolution of all problems which is imposed on us by our commitment to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

82. Malta, for its part, remains steadfast in its adherence to the fundamental principles of international relations enshrined in the Charter, upon which our own survival as a sovereign and independent State depends. This commitment leaves us no option but to deplore the events which have taken place in Grenada over the past few days, to express our profound sadness at the loss of life which has occurred and to call for an immediate withdrawal of all foreign presence from the island and for the immediate restoration to the people of Grenada of the full exercise of their national sovereignty.

83. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): As agreed in the course of the Council's consultations, I intend to suspend the meeting now until 9 p.m. Following the resumption of the meeting, the remainder of the representatives whose names are on the list of speakers will be heard. The Council will then proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it.

The meeting was suspended at 8 p.m. and resumed at 9.50 p.m.

84. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to ask all those who have been invited to participate in this meeting without the right to vote to bear in mind how many speakers we have for this evening. I would request them also to bear in mind the lateness of the hour in the statements that they make.

85. The next speaker is the representative of Benin. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

86. Mr. OGOUMA (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month of October and, through you, I thank all the members of the Council for agreeing to our request to be allowed to speak on the urgent matter now under discussion. I wish to express to Mr. Noel Sinclair, the representative of Guyana, the satisfaction of the Benin delegation on the able and effective manner in which he presided over the work of the Council during September.

87. The events that have been taking place over the last 72 hours in Grenada constitute a serious act of armed aggression and invasion against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of a small State, which is, nevertheless, responsible and sovereign, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and a Member of the United Nations.

88. Speaking on behalf of the People's Republic of Benin, which is also a small, sovereign, free country and was the victim of imperialist armed aggression on 16 January 1977, we are entitled to say today that aggressors, in order to justify and cover up their crimes, always present all sorts of fallacious reasons, such as the protection of their nationals, the defence of a certain kind of democracy and of "civilization", a struggle against the penetration of communism, and so on and so forth.

89. Have we not already heard all these reasons advanced, directly or indirectly, since the independent, sovereign State of Grenada was put to the fire and the sword?

90. The armed aggression that has just been committed against Grenada is in our opinion unjustified and is part of gunboat diplomacy, the policy of a great Power intoxicated by its selfish interests. It is a typical example of recolonization, colonial reconquest, which we strongly condemn.

91. This armed aggression is a serious threat to the maintenance of peace and security in the region. It is a flagrant violation of the sacred principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Article 2, paragraph 4, and it is a rather curious coincidence that it is taking place 38 years to the day since the Charter entered into force.

92. Scrupulous respect for the principles that I have mentioned is an essential condition of the survival of small, defenceless States such as Grenada and Benin. Each people is free to choose the socio-political system it wishes to have, without outside interference.

93. My delegation strongly condemns the foreign armed aggression against Grenada, a sovereign State, a member of the Non-Aligned Movement and a Member of the United Nations. We call for the immediate withdrawal from that country of all the forces of intervention so as to allow the Grenadian people themselves to decide their future.

94. On behalf of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Benin and of the National Executive Council, my delegation expresses the solidarity of the people of Benin with the people of Grenada in their heroic struggle.

95. Is not what is happening now in Grenada a test of the vigilance of the peoples and of the international community? Is it not an experiment in a Machiavellian strategy the first scene of which has just taken place in Grenada and which is aimed, in the final analysis, at the colonial reconquest of certain countries? That is why the Security Council, and thereby the United Nations, must take firm, concrete measures to guarantee the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of Grenada. My delegation invites the Security Council to shoulder this international responsibility by adopting the draft resolution submitted by Guyana, Nicaragua and Zimbabwe.

96. Ready for the revolution; the struggle continues.

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

98. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): First of all, Sir, I wish to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I assure you that we have full confidence in your experience and your diplomatic ability enabling you to preside effectively over the work of the Council at this difficult time. I should like also to congratulate the representative of Guyana, Mr. Sinclair, on his work as President of the Security Council last month, when his ability was evident to all.

99. We shall heed your appeal, Mr. President, and confine ourselves to making a very brief statement expressing the position of Egypt.

100. Events over the last few days and weeks in Grenada have given rise to feelings of deep concern and sorrow, for

those events have brought about a deterioration in the situation in the region and an increase in tensions there. The events in Grenada are a major source of concern for the international community as a whole.

101. Experience in other regions—in our region, the Middle East, for example—teaches us that the use of force and violence cannot resolve problems, but only leads to perpetuating and exacerbating them, and even to the creation of new problems which, in turn, spark new hotbeds of tension. This causes increase instability in international relations.

102. On that premise, and as a non-aligned country, Egypt has always affirmed and continues to affirm the importance of adhering to the main principles on which the Charter of the United Nations is based and which depend on respect in letter and spirit for continuity and stability in the international order and international relations. Foremost among them is the principle of non-intervention in any manner whatsoever in the internal affairs of other States.

103. In the present international circumstances it is the duty of all of us—the Security Council in particular—to try to prevent any spreading of the conflict between East and West to third-world States, for that conflict can only lead to a diversion of the limited resources of those States from development efforts, preventing them from attaining independence and from exercising their right of self-determination.

104. Accordingly we reiterate once more the importance of adherence to the principles of the Charter and of international law in respect of friendly relations and co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and other international agreements and instruments, primarily the charter of the Organization of American States (OAS), all of whose members have undertaken to abide by these principles in their international relations.

105. In the light of what I have said, and given the political factors bearing on this matter, we call for the prompt withdrawal of all foreign troops from Grenada so as to ensure that the people of that island can, without interference in their internal affairs, proceed on their own path and freely determine their own political, economic and social future, so that good-neighbourly relations among the States of the region can be restored.

106. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Venezuela. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

107. Mr. MARTINI URDANETA (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of my delegation I thank the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to participate in this discussion.

108. Venezuela has always maintained that the Caribbean region should be a zone of peace and has spared no effort in contributing to that end. We reiterate our commitment to this concept, especially to the institutionalization of freedom and democracy along with non-intervention, the self-determination of peoples and full respect for human rights.

109. The Government of Venezuela made clear its position with regard to the events in Grenada through a communiqué disseminated through all the communications media of my country on 25 October. The text of that communiqué is as follows:

"First, it is public knowledge that in recent days a serious political crisis took place in Grenada, whose violent developments led to the overthrow and execution of the head of Government, Mr. Maurice Bishop, and to the emergence of a military régime which, according to the scanty information that has filtered through the isolation imposed by that régime, attempted to consolidate itself by force in the face of apparent rejection by the population. These events prompted unanimous condemnation by countries in the area and generated great concern about the repercussions they might have on peace in the region.

"Secondly, within the critical Caribbean context, the democratic Governments of CARICOM [the Caribbean Community] have been insisting, especially at the Ocho Rios and Chaguaramos meetings, on requiring all members of the Community fully to respect human rights and to establish representative democracies.

"Thirdly, in these circumstances, the Governments of various democratic countries of the area agreed to support a joint military action, invoking security instruments entered into by them, to confront what, in their view, was a situation which posed an imminent threat to peace in the region.

"Fourthly, today [25 October] combined forces of Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Jamaica, Barbados, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadians, and the United States of America landed in the neighbouring country of Grenada, an action which further exacerbated the critical situation which had been developing over the preceding days.

"Fifthly, Venezuela, as a Caribbean country and as the Latin American nation which is closest to Grenada geographically, has a special interest in maintaining peace and security in the region and in respect being shown for the norms which govern international relations. For Venezuela it is essential that basic principles of the inter-American system be preserved, principles which are fully reflected in its constitution, such as non-intervention, the self-determination of peoples, full respect for human rights, and the institutionalization of democracy and freedom. Therefore we cannot approve of any form of intervention by foreign armed forces in the internal affairs of a State.

"Sixthly, Venezuela defends and supports the lasting value of these principles in their full meaning as means

to attain the highest forms of coexistence and to allow the full and free development of persons and nations. We must in this regard endorse what we have already stated at the present session of the United Nations General Assembly: 'Non-intervention attains its true expression when it is based on the full exercise of self-determination.'[2]

"Seventhly, in conformity with the principles that guide its international action, the Government of Venezuela—a consistent friend of the democratic nations of the Caribbean—has a position based on the following objectives: (*a*) the cessation of the armed struggle; (*b*) the cessation of all foreign intervention in Grenada so that the people of that country can exercise the right to self-determination freely and fully; (*c*) complete respect for the guarantees of human rights and for the guiding principles of the inter-American community; and (*d*) the preservation of the Caribbean as a zone of peace, removed from the confrontation between the big Powers."

I believe that that communiqué makes perfectly clear Venezuela's position on the events that have occurred in Grenada.

110. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Peru. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

111. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is a pleasure for me, Sir, to extend to you again the congratulations of the delegation of Peru on the considered and skilful way in which you have been guiding the debates as President of the Security Council.

112. A cornerstone of the foreign policy of Peru is strict respect for and observance of the principles and rules governing relations among nations in the international community. Among these rules, contained in the Charter of the United Nations, are the observance of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal and external affairs of States, respect for the self-determination and independence of peoples, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, abstention from the threat or use of force in international relations. These are fundamental pillars on which the hopes for peace and international coexistence rest.

113. Peru has followed the events in Grenada very closely and attentively. It felt deep consternation and surprise upon learning of the culmination of this matter in the events of the past few days, which make it patently and painfully clear that the principles to which I have just referred have been violated.

114. Peru, which has respect for the international legal order, must express its vehement rejection of these flagrant violations of international rules which has bereaved the American family. Moreover, my country cannot conceal its concern at the consequences that these events might have; they could take us back to stages in international relations that we had thought had been overcome.

115. Whenever the sovereignty of a country in Africa, Asia, the Americas, or any other region has been threatened or undermined in the past, my country has always held the same position, calling for respect for the rules of international law, in particular those enshrining the principles to which I have just referred.

116. Faced with the events in the Caribbean that have brought us together today, we repeat our position and urge the Security Council to deploy its best efforts towards ensuring that States abide by the rules that sustain peaceful coexistence in international relations. We also, with all due respect, urge the Council to encourage the adoption of a viable and constructive alternative to solve the crisis besetting us today, a solution that will guarantee the withdrawal of all the foreign forces now in Grenada so that the people of that country can freely exercise its right to self-determination.

117. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Barbados. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

118. Mr. MOSELEY (Barbados): It is my pleasant duty to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of this body for the month of October. I must also thank the members of the Council for their generosity in granting me permission to address them. I congratulate you too, Mr. President, on the manner in which you have performed the duties of your high office, and I welcome the opportunity to record my delegation's congratulations to your immediate predecessor in office, Mr. Noel Sinclair, representative of Guyana, on his outstanding success in conducting the affairs of the Council during September.

119. The item of the agenda which is the subject of this debate involves my country, Barbados, to a very serious degree. I propose therefore in my statement to set out with all the clarity at my command what may properly be called the Barbados position.

120. Let me begin by referring to a most significant incident which took place in the Caribbean in the year 1967. The population of the tiny island of Anguilla had become dissatisfied with the administration of the Government which had its headquarters on the island of St. Kitts about 70 miles away. In that year, about a dozen or so men drove off the small police force and established the administrative separation of Anguilla from the rest of the three-island colony then known as St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla. Anguilla is very much smaller than Grenada. Yet it took the presence of warships of the Royal Navy of the United Kingdom to regain control and to establish on the island of Anguilla some sort of coherent constitutional government in accordance with the wishes of the people of Anguilla. The United Kingdom became the butt of severe criticism and even ridicule: the then-familiar term UDI (unilateral declaration of independence) was applied to Anguilla as it had

been applied to the country now properly referred to as Zimbabwe.

121. I regard this incident as significant for two reasons. In the first place, it was the first occasion within memory in the eastern Caribbean that a duly authorized Government was overthrown by force. Secondly, this incident showed how easy it was for a small country, unaccustomed to revolutionary violence, to succumb to even a small group of determined men. At that time, the Commonwealth Caribbean States hastily met to decide what should be done. Eventually, on strictly legal grounds, it was decided that the responsibility was solely that of Britain. It is an interesting footnote that one country in particular, a country now a full Member of the United Nations, was willing, ready and eager to send in its troops to put down the rebellion. Happily, that country was restrained by other countries, including my own.

122. At this point, I consider it of the utmost importance for the better understanding of the Grenada question that there should be a clear understanding of the sociology and the geography of the geography of the Caribbean islands, and of the eastern Caribbean islands in particular. In these small units it is hardly an exaggeration to say that everyone knows everyone else and from island to island a very considerable percentage of families on one island are related by blood to others on another island. This is not to take into account the very real relationships, other than those of blood, which exist. On the geographical side there is the relationship between Saint Vincent and Grenada as an apt example. Between those two islands separated by about 90 miles of sea there is a chain of islands like stepping-stones across a brook.

123. The members of this Council might well question the relevance of these descriptions. I will answer by saying that this is the context in which one must measure the fears and anxieties and concerns of the people of one island in respect of the events which might occur in another. It is in this context that one must see the reason for, and read the legislation which lies at the root of, my country's participation in the events leading up to going to the assistance of the people of Grenada.

124. The tiny, poor and unarmed islands which form what is sometimes known as the Windward and Leeward Islands, recognizing their vulnerability, established the OECS and made provision in their laws for mutual defence and support. Along with some members of the OECS, Barbados entered into a regional defence treaty.

125. If I may leave this aspect of my statement for a while, I would wish to deal with what one might appropriately call the historical aspect of the Barbados position. Barbados has never wavered in its strict adherence to the principles of self-determination, territorial integrity and respect for sovereignty. The record of my country in these matters, as in the matter of human rights, stands proud for all to read.

126. In this context, it must be said that my country, with its free press and parliamentary government, responds to scurrilous attacks by making the observation by which we live, namely, that we may disagree with what you say but we shall defend to the death your right to say it.

127. Now I would wish to put the pieces together to form the mosaic and the true scenario which led to the events of the past few fateful weeks.

128. Prior to 13 March 1979, Grenada was governed—or rather misgoverned—by a régime which my country openly detested. Barbados would not and did not interfere, either overtly or covertly, since the Government was a duly constituted one and there was a recognizable constitutional fabric.

129. On 13 March 1979, the late Mr. Maurice Bishop led a *coup*—the first coup of such magnitude in the Commonwealth Caribbean. Again Barbados did not interfere. The will of the Grenadian people appeared to have prevailed. On this basis, Barbados was among the very first to extend a helping hand to Mr. Bishop. Hands off Grenada.

130. The same Barbados was among the first in the region to recognize the young Fidel Castro and the Cuban revolution. Barbados has never had a revolution. Barbados, with its well-earned reputation for stability of government and of economy, was never afraid to put into practice its declared adherence to the principle of self-determination of peoples. It was the same Barbados which encouraged countries inside and outside the Caribbean to give Maurice Bishop a chance to establish a better régime for his people. The one condition was that he should, in good time, institute a system of popular elections. When, to the expressed disappointment of Barbados, Mr. Bishop failed to meet that condition in good time, Barbados nevertheless refused to desert Grenada, refused to allow discrimination against Grenada in matters of regional economic aid. No presence of Cuban or other advisers deterred Barbados from adherence to the cherished principles which have been enunciated in this statement.

131. This Chamber—the Security Council—and the drama that is so often played out in it are creatures of law. We are foregathered here, at least ostensibly, to discuss issues of international law that touch and concern the peace and security of the eastern Caribbean region. But law and the order it seeks to create are an emanation from the human mind and soul. Law, whether municipal or international, does not exist in a vacuum. It does not subserve collectivities of inanimate automata; it is a social tissue woven by human beings of flesh and blood around themselves to preserve and enhance their humanity.

132. The Barbados delegation has listened with fascination, at times with incredulity, to the debate in this chamber. Have members not noticed how little is actually said about Grenada? About the thousands of human beings and the tragic events that have seared themselves indelibly on their minds in letters of red?

133. When the late Mr. Maurice Bishop, yet unknown to international fame, fled the wrath of the Gairy régime, where did he go? Not to Cuba, not to Nicaragua, not to Guyana—he fled to Barbados, his limbs broken, his body

bleeding. Barbados did not turn him away. Barbados gave him succour.

134. As I have said before, when his Government came into power by a bloodless *coup*, Barbados was among the first States to recognize his régime. And I repeat, we were among the first in the Commonwealth Caribbean to establish relations with the Government of Cuba. Two nights ago, we lived to hear ourselves referred to as lackeys and hyenas. That nasty reference does not bother us unduly. In the case of Cuba some years ago, we believed we were acting on principle. Our actions following the tragic events in Grenada were based no less on principle as we, in our lights, perceive it.

135. In March 1979 we not only recognized the Bishop Administration, we also gave it technical assistance. We were not entirely happy with the manner of seizing and maintaining power, but we took no steps to destabilize his Government. We respected the sovereignty of Grenada. We were vocal in our concern about the delay in returning to a parliamentary system. Yet, when lenders to the regional Caribbean Development Bank sought to apply financial and political pressure on Grenada, we resisted it. Again we acted on principle as we perceived it. We went on record as saying that we did not agree to countries using the regional development bank as a pressure point against Grenada, or any other Bank member, for that matter.

136. I began outlining the ancient and enduring links of family and friendship that bind our peoples throughout that beautiful archipelago of islands. You are therefore now, I hope, more effectively sensitized as to the horrific impact which the brutal murders have had upon our fraternal countries.

137. Quite understandably this debate has tended to focus on the late Mr. Bishop. But other died as well, and it was not just their deaths but the inhuman manner in which they died that shocked the fraternal peoples of the neighbouring islands. Let us never forget that Bishop was shot at point-blank range, with his hands in the air, in an unmistakable posture of surrender. He was executed without even the show of a trial—this after he had been set free by a spontaneous surge of support from the masses, his grass-roots supporters.

138. Also murdered when totally unable to defend themselves were the Foreign Minister, Mr. Unison Whiteman, who but a few days ago addressed the General Assembly at the 32nd meeting of its thirty-eighth session; the Minister of Housing, Mr. Norris Bain, the former President of the Bank of Grenada and the Grenada Workers Union, the late Mr. Vincent Noel; and Fitzroy Bain, the President of the Agricultural and General Workers Union. Last, but in the scale of tragedy and brutality not least, was the late Jacquline Creft. She was bludgeoned to death.

139. It was Danton who commented bitterly that, like Saturn, the French revolution he did so much to create was devouring its children. Danton spoke metaphorically. In Grenada it was actually happening. According to reports reaching us, children were the targets of bullets in this spasm of terror. To leave nothing undone in the reign of terror, a 96-hour curfew was imposed. Men, women and children were repeatedly warned that they would be shot on sight if they appeared out of doors.

140. Against this sombre background the following considerations became starkly relevant and urgent.

141. First, the member States of the OECS were deeply concerned that this situation would continued to worsen, that there would be further loss of life, personal injury and a deterioration of public order as the military group in control attempted to secure its position. Secondly, member Governments considered that the subsequent imposition of a draconian 96-hour curfew by the military group in control was intended to allow them further to suppress the population of Grenada, which had by numerous demonstrations shown its hostility to that group. Thirdly, member Governments have also been greatly concerned that the extensive military buildup in Grenada over the last few years had created a situation of disproportionate military strength between Grenada and other OECS countries. This military might in the hands of the present group has posed a serious threat to the security of the OECS countries and other neighbouring States. Fourthly, Member Governments considered it of the utmost urgency that immediate steps should be taken to remove that threat. Fifthly, under the provisions of article 8 of the Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, concerning defence and security in the subregion, member Governments of the organization decided to take appropriate action.

142. I now turn to the legal aspects.

143. The action taken by Jamaica, the eastern Caribbean States and Barbados was perfectly legal. It was within the letter and the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

144. The eastern Caribbean States have placed their co-operation for economic, political and military purposes on a sound legal basis. First, there is a treaty binding those States. Some delegations have scoffingly referred to it as "a so-called treaty". Does this make it less of a treaty in international law? Is a treaty a treaty only when it is concluded between certain Powers? Are we to ignore pacts and agreements made for mutual defence and support among small States because they are neither NATO nor Warsaw Pact countries?

145. Under the treaty a defence and security committee has been established. It consists of the ministers responsible for defence and security or other ministers or plenipotentiaries designated by heads of Government of member States. The leaders of these States further provided and mutually agreed that the defence and security committee shall have responsibility for co-ordinating the efforts of member States for collective defence and the preservation of peace and security against external aggression and for the development of closer ties among the member States of the organization in matters of external defence and security, including measures to combat the activities of mercenaries operating with or without the support of internal or national elements in the exercise of the inherent right of

individual or collective self-defence recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

146. As I stated earlier, there existed the horror of the brutal slaughter, the draconian 96-hour curfew by the military group in control. There was in the OECS an awareness that the extensive military buildup in Grenada over the last four years had created a situation of disproportionate military strength between Grenada and the other OECS member countries. This military might in the hands of a group that had so brutally murdered so many ministers of government and some private citizens as well was perceived to be a serious threat to the security of the OECS member countries and other neighbouring States. Therefore member Governments of the OECS considered the matter to be of the utmost urgency and took the initiative to set in train immediate steps which would remove this threat with minimum delay and loss of life. Reports coming out of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, separated from Grenada by the stepping-stones of islets, told of over 50 people bearing arms entering Saint Vincent from Grenada. These people had to be disarmed.

147. The second aspect of legality is the regional defence pact to which I referred earlier and by which Barbados considers itself bound.

148. I turn now to the third aspect of legality. Let it not be forgotten that it was the Governor-General of Grenada, the sole link of authority with the massacred Bishop Government, who formally called on the members of the OECS to come to the aid of his country. Under Section 57 of the Grenada Constitution Order 1973, the Governor-General of that country assumes full executive authority for the administration of the State in the absence of a prime minister and parliament. Prime Minister Bishop and four of his ministers had been killed. Those ministers who had not been killed had resigned.

149. Finally there is another and bitter aspect of the tragedy that is Grenada. This debate is not about Grenada and the human beings who have still to live out their lives there. What concrete suggestions have been made to ameliorate the desperate situation there? Only hollow words. Some have come here to put their respective political cases as heatedly and emotionally as they can. Barbados, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and the rest of us are still neighbours and friends of Grenada. After we rise tonight the problem of these people will still be out there in the eastern Caribbean in all its grave dimensions.

150. The island inhabitants of the Caribbean must and will continue to live as brothers and sisters, bearing one another's burdens as best we can. We, as sister islands, have to help Grenada, to carry it on our backs if necessary. Little that has been said and done here makes our task any easier.

151. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Angola. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

152. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): Mr. President, allow me to pay tribute to all those around the world, and in Grenada in particular, who are defending the right of nations to independence and independent choices and who are laying down their lives to defend freedom.

153. The armed might of a super-Power—a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and one of the strongest countries in the world in terms of military, political, economic and technological strength—has invaded in full force a small Caribbean island, small and defenceless, but also independent and sovereign and due the respect to its sovereignty and territorial integrity which its status demands in international law and under the Charter of the United Nations.

154. The world has seldom seen, at least in recent history, such an uncalled for massive military action, on such a vast scale, against such a small target in such unjustified circumstances. This military invasion violates not one but many of the provisions of the Charter. This invasion proves the point which many of the small third world countries have made time and time again—that none of us are ever secure against acts of imperialism, and certainly not in an area where the United States has a history of political interference and military intervention, so ably chronicled by the representative of Nicaragua in his statement two days ago.

155. Radio broadcasts monitored in the United States since last week showed no threat emanating from the purely internal and domestic event that took place in Grenada. Dr. Modica, rector of the college where the United States students and students from 23 other countries were registered, stated that the students were never in danger. The excuse for the invasion is as pathetic as the action itself is illegal.

156. The invasion is an attack on law and order in the Caribbean. Its repercussions will not be limited to the eastern Caribbean, to Central America, or to Latin America. The implications are being recorded far and wide, not least of all in southern Africa, a region where the United States has always supported, overtly and covertly, the racist minority régime in Pretoria and its illegal occupation of Namibia and parts of southern Angola. Where the United States cannot use surrogate forces, it dispatches its own armed forces. Indeed, it is tragic that in this latest venture a group of non-aligned countries have lent themselves to the nefarious designs of the United States, attempting to provide—but failing to do so—a hint of legality for the invasion of a non-aligned neighbour. Even this attempt at legality fails in view of the fact that the United States fleet moved towards Grenada on Thursday, before the so-called request for assistance from the OECS.

157. We, the non-aligned nations, must take a firm, united stand against the United States invasion of Grenada. We must condemn the invasion; we must show full solidarity and support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Grenada, and we must call for the immediate withdrawal of United States forces from that island.

158. When we talk of imperialism, we are not referring to an event in the distant past. When we talk of colonialism, we are not referring to an institution long dead and gone. What happened two days ago to the people of Grenada shows that imperialism is alive and well and is being launched from the shores of the United States.

159. I wonder how many had an opportunity to monitor the radio orders being given to the people of Grenada by the invading forces. The entire action is one of invasion, occupation and control. The message is that unless sovereign nations comply with the dictates of imperialism, they will be subjected to military and other reprisals. Well, we have received that message loud and clear. We reject the message and we condemn the sender.

160. And our message to each other, as non-aligned nations, should be the caveat: *Hodie mihi, cras tibi*—today me, tomorrow you.

161. The struggle continues; victory is assured!

162. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Hungary. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

163. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary): Mr. President, allow me first of all to express my delegation's appreciation to you and to the other members of the Security Council for the opportunity extended to us to speak on this important issue before the Council.

164. The Security Council is meeting at a time when the deterioration of the international situation is a matter of grave concern for most of us. The latest events in the Caribbean region have further heightened the tension, and that is the main reason why my delegation found it necessary to state its views in a very brief statement on the subject before the Council.

165. On 25 October the military forces of the United States, with the symbolic participation of some eastern Caribbean States, invaded the small island nation of Grenada. The pretext for the invasion was the "intention to settle" the internal disorder in Grenada which allegedly threatened the security of the United States citizens in Grenada as well as the security of the neighbouring States.

166. My delegation finds the reference to the security treaty as a legal basis and all the attempts at justification presented here by some of the participants in the invasion totally unacceptable. Facts remain facts. The invasion of Grenada is an act of aggression and a violation of the norms of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations. There can be no legal basis for such an action. In fact, there will be no international law if such acts continue to happen in the future. For international relations should be based on principles respected by all States. Respect for the Charter is an obligation of all Member States. A permanent member of the Security Council has a special responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, for trying to find peaceful solutions to all problems and for desisting from all actions which are in contravention of the Charter and international law.

167. It is in this very spirit that my delegation is constrained to state that the great Power in question gave no chance to diplomacy but instead resorted to force when all avenues of negotiation were still open. We cannot but deeply deplore this approach to the solution of international problems.

168. There can be no political or moral justification for such a premeditated and unprovoked act of aggression. Grenada, a small and peaceful country and a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, became the victim of an act of aggression led by one of the most powerful members of the Organization, the United States of America. Beyond the violation of international law, this aspect of the invasion is also alarming for all of us.

169. The leaders of Grenada were making efforts to build a society based on social justice, really equal opportunities and a just distribution of material wealth. The internal contradictions arising in the course of these efforts falls solely to the domestic jurisdiction of Grenada. Only the people of Grenada have the right to decide. What are the perspectives of those countries making efforts in the interests of their people, using concepts of development other than those used by economically more developed countries?

170. A draft resolution was presented by the delegations of Guyana and Nicaragua [*S/16077*] strongly condemning the armed invasion of Grenada and calling for the immediate withdrawal of the invading troops. My delegation fully shares the ideas contained in the draft resolution because they correctly reflect the reactions and sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the international community and are in conformity with an authorized statement of the Hungarian Telegraphic Agency issued from my capital, Budapest, on 26 October, on the invasion of Grenada, which stated the following:

> "The Hungarian People's Republic resolutely condemns the aggression against Grenada and demands, together with other peace-loving countries and peoples of the world, the immediate withdrawal of the invading troops. The Hungarian people is in solidarity with the people of Grenada and sincerely hopes that it will be able to regain control of its own destiny as soon as possible."

171. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Sao Tome and Principe. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

172. Mr. CASSANDRA (Sao Tome and Principe): Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. In the turbulent days ahead you will have a difficult task to perform, but I am quite sure that with your diplomatic skills you will be able to meet this challenge. I would also like to take the opportunity to

congratulate your predecessor, Mr. Sinclair of Guyana, for the way in which he conducted the Council's deliberations last month.

173. The events taking place in Grenada are indeed very disturbing. From what we have learned through the news media and from what we have heard during the debate in the Council Chamber, it would appear that diplomacy, as such, is gradually ceasing to exist. This trend in the conduct of foreign affairs is a phenomenon which is assuming alarming proportions, since one never knows which country will be the next.

174. Small and defenceless countries like Sao Tome and Principe can only exist if protected by international law. It is based on this fear that I am addressing the Council today, since we share many similarities with Grenada. We were always under the assumption that a few cardinal rules on international law were norms generally accepted by the vast majority of United Nations Member States.

175. Two of these norms, simply stated, say that a country has the right to choose the form of government it wishes to live under, and that its borders are inviolable. The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of another country and the inviolability of its borders are probably the cornerstone of the Organization. In fact, Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter states:

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

Furthermore, article 21 of the charter of the Organization of American States is clear. It states:

> "The American States bind themselves in their international relations not to have recourse to the use of force, except in the case of self-defence, in accordance with existing treaties or in fulfilment thereof."

176. The events of the last few days in Grenada and the pattern of violence in Central America are indeed alarming. It means that if one does not like the Government next door or elsewhere, one is justified to use force in the name of "law and order", "restoration of democracy", "protection of one's nationals", "menace from international thugs", and so forth. If this pattern is not stopped, we will be drifting toward international anarchy and entering a blind alley where all will be losers and where we will even lose our most precious commodity, human value.

177. In violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the Organization of American States, a military expeditionary force of the United States of America, supported by Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Jamaica, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Saint Lucia, has invaded the sovereign territory of Grenada invoking unacceptable arguments.

178. This state of affairs is totally unacceptable to my Government. The use or threat of use of force or the use of violence can never be a substitute for diplomacy. Violence and armed intervention will give to its perpetrators a temporary victory only. Any form of government has to be based on the consent of the people. The people of Grenada are entitled to decide their own form of government and freely to determine their own political, economic and social system without outside intervention, coercion or threat.

179. It was with sorrow and a deep sense of frustration that we learned of the death of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and some of his colleagues in the cabinet. It is our firm belief that human life is too precious to be wasted in internal squabbles provoked by ambition and personality conflicts. At the time we deplored these ugly events and prayed for a sane and political solution of the problem. We fail to see the need for an invasion. We fail to see the need for further bloodshed.

180. For all these reasons, my Government condemns the brutal armed invasion of Grenada, which constitutes a flagrant violation of international law and of the sovereignty and the independence of Grenada.

181. We urge the Council to take steps to stop the invasion of that country and to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces. We are convinced that if the Council does not act to stop this flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations, we will be setting a bad precedent. We will be creating a climate of international insecurity that will eventually engulf not only a small country like Sao Tome and Principe, but strike at the very fabric of international relations.

182. In conclusion, I would like to raise this question: is it true that "when history cannot be written with a pen, must it be written with a gun?"

183. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

184. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council is now meeting in urgent session to consider an act of armed aggression which has practical as well as moral implications. It is a new act of armed aggression by the United States, this time against the young Republic of Grenada. It has shown the world that without the slightest doubt American imperialism is now committing an act of direct military interference on a large scale against a sovereign, independent State in the Caribbean and is thereby trampling underfoot, in the most brutal manner, the fundamental freedoms and rights of its people.

185. The international community is already aware of the tragic facts. The latest information confirms that fighting is continuing in Grenada and makes mention of the resistance against the aggressors. Members of the civilian population have been killed, including several Cuban spe-

cialists there to lend their fraternal assistance to the people of Grenada. Once again American Marines are using force against a people and destroying its governmental institutions.

186. The open armed aggression, planned and prepared in advance a long time ago, by the United States against Grenada constitutes a flagrant violation of the fundamental norms and principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. This action by the United States against Grenada is a further challenge to the international community and the United Nations.

187. The arguments arbitrarily invented by the American side to justify this act of aggression are absolutely unfounded. Thus, there is only one logical explanation, namely, that the policy followed by Grenada and its people's choice of the way to build its future are not to the liking of American imperialism. It is clear that the United States decided to impose its neo-colonialist will on the people of Grenada whatever the cost, despite the heroic resistance to the invaders and the profound sense of outrage felt by the international communit

188. Of course, this is not the first time that we have witnessed such actions by American imperialism directed against peoples and Governments, whether in Asia, Africa or Latin America. The region of Central America and the Caribbean has for a long time been the object of massive acts of armed provocation by the United States. The peoples of Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada and other countries in the region are well aware of this reality. There is absolutely no doubt that this unacceptable pressure on those countries and the brutal interference in their internal affairs are designed to stifle progressive change, to hamper social progress and to change the substance of their policy.

189. The "big stick" policy practised by the United States against countries and peoples in this region and elsewhere is the fundamental cause of the creation of tension in international relations and of the provocation of conflicts which truly threaten international peace and security. At the present time this is noted once again by the international community, which raises its voice in protest against Washington's militaristic policy.

190. The Security Council, the United Nations organ which under the Charter is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, must categorically condemn this act of aggression against Grenada and take all the appropriate urgent measures to ensure the immediate cessation of this act of aggression and the withdrawal of the foreign invasion troops.

191. Yesterday, the following statement was issued by the Bulgarian Telegraph Agency:

> "The People's Republic of Bulgaria and Bulgarian public opinion strongly condemn the United States aggression against the peace-loving people of Grenada and call for the immediate cessation of this aggression and the withdrawal of foreign troops from that country. The Bulgarian people express their unreserved solidarity with Grenada in its just struggle in defence of its sovereignty and independence."

192. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of German Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

193. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): First of all, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Security Council for giving me this opportunity to explain my country's position on the very important question now under consideration.

194. The German Democratic Republic joins all those who most resolutely condemn the predatory and unscrupulous attack of the United States and the mercenaries recruited by it on a sovereign, non-aligned State in the Caribbean. This act of piracy is a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations and all the norms regulating civilized intergovernmental relations. We therefore welcome the fact that the Security Council, pursuant to its mandate, has convened without delay to consider the existing extremely critical situation. It is a matter of great urgency to counter this latest onslaught of the United States on world peace and security with effective measures by the United Nations and to put an end to the outdated policy of military aggression, colonial oppression and blackmail.

195. The aggression against Grenada has again unmasked the overtly militaristic and presumptuous character of present United States policy, which has recourse to the use of its military machinery wherever it seeks to achieve its aims of domination, to force its dictates upon other countries and peoples and to impress its mark of neo-colonialism on the developing countries. This military invasion of the United States into Grenada is part of the global policy of confrontation and super-armament of United States imperialism, which endangers peace and international security to the very utmost. This revival of the ill-famed gunboat policy aimed against the social progress and self-determination of peoples in all regions of the globe, whether in the Caribbean, in Central America, in the Middle East, in the Indian Ocean or in Europe, using the nuclear big stick, must be brought to a halt. This is the precondition for preventing the unimaginable escalation of tensions to a nuclear holocaust. While aircraft carriers from the United States—equipped, as is known, with nuclear weapons—are constantly cruising in the Caribbean and in other regions, preparations for the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe are in full swing. Do not the peoples have to expect that those who make use of such aircraft carriers to employ conventional weapons against a country such as Grenada will one day make use of nuclear weapons against other States under the flimsy pretext of vital interests?

196. One important lesson to draw from the invasion of Grenada by the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, therefore, should be the need to adopt effective

resolutions to avert the threat of a nuclear war and to return to commonsense in international relations.

197. The United States is fully responsible for the military action of force against the independent, non-aligned country of Grenada and for the consequences of that action. That action is aimed at reversing the revolutionary process in Grenada and at subjugating that country to the neo-colonialist rule of the United States. This shows what we must understand by democracy, freedom and human rights in the United States manner and how Washington views peace-keeping operations for guaranteeing the self-determination and sovereignty of countries such as Grenada and Lebanon. What region and what country in the world would not be of vital interest to those quarters today? Does that not mean that every State that permits citizens of the United States to study at its universities or to stay for other reasons in its territory has to expect an armed aggression under the pretext of the protection of those citizens should it happen to fit into the global-strategic plans of the United States Administration? The aggression against Grenada demonstrates with what dangerous consequences the peoples and States must reckon if the United States succeeds in achieving global military superiority.

198. We share the deep concern expressed in this regard by preceding speakers from non-aligned countries during this debate, and we most resolutely support the demands for an immediate cessation of the invasion and for the withdrawal of United States troops, together with its foreign mercenaries, from Grenada.

199. Before concluding, I wish to offer to the peoples of Grenada and Cuba the heartfelt condolences of the people of the German Democratic Republic on the occasion of the violent deaths of their compatriots who became victims of this barbarous aggression.

200. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): My delegation has already offered to you, Mr. President, our congratulations and our thanks to your predecessor, Mr. Sinclair, for his tireless and effective conduct of the presidency of the Council. However, I cannot resist adding my personal respects to you, Sir, and my admiration for the way in which you have conducted affairs.

201. We began this debate at a late hour on Tuesday in response to an immediate request from Nicaragua. We have heard many speeches, some of them highly emotional, about the situation in Grenada. By common consent that situation was serious. After all, the Prime Minister had just been murdered, and the population were confined to their homes at gunpoint. But apart from the fact that all delegations agree on the serious situation that had arisen in the island, we have heard sharp disagreements about the actions taken to meet it. My Government made it plain in an emergency debate in the House of Commons that it had serious doubts about some of those actions. Our position is on record, and I will not repeat today everything that was said at greater length in London yesterday. What I aim to do is to consider with my colleagues in the Security Council what our common aim should be and how we can contribute to bring it about.

202. I suggest that in accordance with the vast majority of the speeches we have heard and on the basis of the Charter our common aim should be the emergence of a constitutional Grenadian Government freely elected by the Grenadian people. I am talking, of course, about a real democratic Government based on the exercise of self-determination by the Grenadian people. This is a very different thing from the régime—it did not call itself a Government—which was holding hostage the people of Grenada and potentially some other residents in the island. It is evident that in the murky situation created by the murder of the Prime Minister and other cabinet ministers of the Grenadian Government there was an atmosphere of uncertainty and even terror in the island. Lives, liberty and self-determination were at risk. Indeed, it seems possible that Mr. Bishop was assassinated because he and some of his colleagues were moving—not before time, I may add—in the direction of holding elections. As a great British historian, Lord Acton, repeatedly stressed, political assassination is the great crime against liberty.

203. Given this situation, it is not surprising that the terror in the island produced a sense of fear in the region. The Prime Minister of Dominica, who is also the Chairperson of the OECS told us, in measured and eloquent terms, that all the existing Governments of that organization were afraid. They were afraid, she said, that, "this situation would continue to worsen, that there would be further loss of life, personal injury and a general deterioration of public order" [*see 2489th meeting, para. 6*]. Her Government and others considered that the military group in control intended, by imposing a draconian curfew "to suppress further the population of Grenada, which had shown by numerous demonstrations their hostility to this group" [*ibid., para. 7*].

204. The splendid and moving speeches by the representatives of the OECS and of Jamaica and Barbados have reinforced these points. These speeches have, I think, had a profound effect on those delegations which have not hitherto been closely informed about the situation in the eastern Caribbean.

205. Nor is it surprising that foreign Governments were concerned about the safety of their nationals in Grenada. My Government was one of those. We took what we considered were appropriate steps: we sent a British diplomat to Grenada to investigate the situation, and, more or less simultaneously, we directed a British frigate, *HMS Antrim*, to proceed to the vicinity of Grenada on a contingency basis in case the situation should deteriorate to the point at which British nationals had to be evacuated from Grenada under difficult circumstances. We were cautious and did not go beyond these contingency preparations.

206. Other Governments were, like mine, highly concerned for the safety of their nationals. Members of the Security Council will be familiar, for example, with the statements on this point, made through the public media,

by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Dominica.

207. We must all be grateful that the Governor-General, a distinguished Grenadian citizen and the only remaining constitutional authority in the island, has survived the bloody events of recent days. He will, we assume, now have to play his constitutional role as a focus for the re-establishment of constitutional government in Grenada.

208. I do not pretend to give here a full account of all the events of recent days. But I hope I have said enough to illustrate that internal events in Grenada had created a situation which led to terror in the island and fear in the region and which gave legitimate grounds for concern to many Governments, especially those with nationals on the island. There was thus a tense and difficult situation.

209. Meetings were held of the OECS and of CARICOM. This latter body comprises all the members of the OECS, plus six other Caribbean countries. There was, it seems, a debate and a legitimate difference of opinion about what steps to take regionally to deal with what was evidently becoming a regional problem. These differences of opinion have been reflected in the interventions made in this debate.

210. Approaches were made to my Government as to what action we would be willing to take in conjunction with certain Caribbean countries. It is no secret that we urged on all those who consulted us prudence and caution. Other views prevailed. My Government took no part in the military operation which has been carried out in Grenada. It is very plain that my Government did not support those operations and that we wished a different course of action to be followed. But that is not to say that we did not consider the situation grave, risky and difficult. We can understand the concerns of those who took action. We are glad that several other speakers in this debate have expressed similar understanding.

211. We regret that this understanding is not reflected in the draft resolution [*S/16077/Rev.1*] before us. Of course, emotions run high and some of the speeches which have been made in support of the draft resolution were, to say the least, highly charged.

212. Reputation is important in international as well as in domestic politics. The Governments which took action in Grenada are of the highest reputation. The suggestion that the United States of America is a foe to liberty and democracy, as some speakers have allowed themselves to say, is simply ridiculous. It is a pity that our debates should be sullied by such untruths. I must say that I resent such statements.

213. Similarly, I must draw the attention of the Council to the high reputation of the Caribbean States involved in the Grenada operation. I am proud to acknowledge them as fellow members of the Commonwealth. In a world where all too often we are faced with movements, *coups* and régimes which act against liberty and in contravention of the inherent right of self-determination, these are democratic Governments, freely elected and representing people who enjoy liberties that have been suppressed in many other countries.

214. If on occasion our judgements differ, we do not doubt their sincerity or that their motives were honourable. Their stated objective is to restore democratic and constitutional government to the island. That is an objective we fully share. I need hardly say that my delegation's respect for all the members of CARICOM is the same. In this particular instance we agree with some more than with others, but I repeat that we attach equal importance to the views of all the honourable, independent and democratic members of the Commonwealth in the Caribbean.

215. Against this background it will be no surprise that my Government cannot go along with a draft resolution which does not take adequate account of the concerns which have motivated the OECS, Jamaica, Barbados and the United States. But, as I said at the outset, it should be the aim of the Security Council to consider ways in which our common aim of the emergence of constitutional Grenadian government, freely elected by the Grenadian people, can be promoted. It is not for us to tell the Grenadian people how to run their affairs. But I believe we can legitimately give encouragement to the forces of constitutionality and to the right of self-determination. That is the message which my delegation would like to see go out from this debate.

216. Vituperation and unmeasured rhetoric will not get us anywhere. What we need now is common sense and a respect for democratic decencies. My Government knows that these are qualities which pre-eminently characterize the members of the Commonwealth. We are confident that the people of Grenada, when enabled once again to participate in free and fair elections, will themselves display these qualities.

217. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

218. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): I begin, Sir, by reiterating my congratulations on your assumption of the presidency and the manner in which you have been conducting the proceedings of the Council. I also thank you and, through you, the other Council members for permitting me to address the Council on this subject.

219. I should like to begin by reading into the records of the Security Council the text of the statement issued by the Government of India yesterday, 26 October:

[The speaker read the text of the annex to documents S/16078.]

220. Recent developments in Grenada and the invasion of that country have aroused widespread concern and indignation all over the world. Non-aligned countries in particular are profoundly affected and concerned by these developments and the serious implications and far-

reaching consequences of this military action against an independent and sovereign State Member of the United Nations, member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and member of the Commonwealth.

221. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has always resolutely condemned the use or threat of use of force as well as intervention or interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States. It has always reaffirmed the right of all countries to preserve their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and the right of their peoples to choose their own political, economic and social systems and pursue their own development free from any external interference or pressures. The Charter of the United Nations provides the basic framework for the conduct of States in their relations with one another. The Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations[1] and the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty[3] provide additional guidelines derived from the purposes and principles of the Charter. Armed intervention, such as that which has now overtaken the hapless and helpless people of Grenada, is a clear violation of these norms of behaviour and should be firmly rejected as impermissible and unacceptable.

222. The developments in Grenada have, therefore, caused deep disquiet and grave concern among the non-aligned countries. If immediate remedial action is not taken, the consequences for international peace and security could be dangerous and the credibility of the United Nations will be seriously impaired.

223. I should like to recall that the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, declared:

> "The Heads of State or Government condemned the covert and overt actions and the political and economic pressures being exerted by imperialist forces against Grenada. Mindful of the adverse effects of such pressures on economic development efforts, they expressed support for the inalienable right of the Government and people of Grenada to pursue their own political, economic and social process free from all forms of external pressures and threats. The Heads of State or Government expressed support for the Government and people of Grenada and called on all countries to respect Grenada's independence and sovereignty." [*S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, sect. I, para. 153.*]

224. I should also like to recall that the recent Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegations of the Non-Aligned Countries to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session, held in New York from 4 to 7 October, stated in its final communiqué:

> "The Meeting reaffirmed solidarity with the Government of Grenada in its efforts to preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of political and economic pressures and efforts at destabilisation directed against it." [*S/16035, para. 71.*]

225. It is imperative that the invasion of Grenada be brought to an end without further delay, that all foreign forces be withdrawn immediately from that island and that all intervention and interference in the internal affairs of that country be ended, so that the people of Grenada can exercise their inalienable right freely to determine their own future.

226. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

227. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): Once again my delegation is addressing the Security Council to pledge ourselves to the defence of peace and to plead for respect for the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of non-interference and non-intervention, the prohibition of the use of force in international relations and the obligation to resolve all disputes peacefully. We feel that too little responsibility is shown in seeing that these principles are implemented. If we are to avoid anarchy and disaster we shall have to show more responsibility and more respect for the rights of others.

228. The already tense international situation is deteriorating further. Armed force is being applied ever more frequently, and negotiations as the only viable way of resolving problems are being ever more disregarded. All too frequently the stronger, using military force, intervene in the affairs of the weaker, imposing their will in order to promote their so-called vital interests and to strengthen their hand in bloc rivalry.

229. We feel we have to reject resolutely any use of force, interference, intervention and the suppression of the rights of peoples freely to decide on the manner of their development. We cannot accept this becoming a common practice in international behaviour. Assaults against sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence should be condemned wherever they occur.

230. The recently concluded general debate in the General Assembly was nearly unanimous in its assessment of the overwhelming gravity of the present international situation and in its demand for a political solution to the numerous hotbeds of crises and for the strengthening of international peace and security. The principles of the Charter have been unanimously supported as the basis for such solutions.

231. In our view, every people has an inalienable right to decide on its internal social and political system and its way of life. We feel it is the duty of all others to respect such sovereign decisions whether they like it or not. The right to decide one's own destiny is inalienable and is the highest principle in international relations, a principle which constitutes the basic pre-condition for security and international co-operation.

232. Yugoslavia has consistently opposed, and will continue to oppose, any encroachment upon freedom, any violation of sovereignty, territorial integrity and the independence of countries. We feel that there is not and that there cannot be any justification for intervention, either military or political, ideological or economic.

233. The Caribbean and the region of Central America is faced with deep social, economic and political problems. Those problems should be left to the peoples of that region to resolve, respecting the principle that every people should be able to choose the path of its own development. That basic principle is not being observed and there is a grave and growing crisis in the region.

234. This time Grenada and the people of Grenada are the victim of an armed intervention. This time again the victim is a non-aligned country. In the case of the invasion of Grenada, as in all previous instances, we see no possible justification for such an act.

235. At this point I should like to recall that, in its statement of 26 October, the Government of Yugoslavia pointed out that it received the news of the armed intervention in Grenada with great concern. The statement says that the invasion by the armed forces of the United States and some Caribbean countries is an act unacceptable in international relations, contrary to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-interference in their internal affairs and the right of peoples to a free choice of the manner of their development. The statement of my Government further says that the tragic death of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, which we deeply regret, and the internal upheavals caused thereby, or any other reason, cannot be the pretext for foreign—especially military—intervention and the violation of the independence of a sovereign and non-aligned country, which in the present exacerbated international situation can have serious consequences for peace and security in the region and beyond.

236. The statement of my Government concluded that, proceeding from the known principles of its foreign policy, the Government of Yugoslavia calls for an urgent cessation of the foreign intervention and for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Grenada, in order to enable its people to decide its own destiny, undisturbed and without outside pressures.

237. In conclusion, I should like to thank the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to express the views of my Government.

238. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Guinea-Bissau. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

239. Mr. SEMEDO (Guinea-Bissau) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to begin by thanking you for permitting me, as the representative of a small State, to speak here before the Council to state our views on the disturbing events that took place on 25 October in Grenada and which are now the main focus of the international scene.

240. Sir, on behalf of the delegation of Guinea-Bissau and on my own personal behalf, I should like to say how happy we are at seeing you preside over the work of the Council. We are convinced that with your great ability and your well-recognized qualities as a diplomat we shall arrive at successful results. I should also like to thank and congratulate Mr. Sinclair of Guyana for the brilliant manner in which he presided over the work of the Council during the month of September.

241. In view of the tragic situation in Grenada since the foreign military invasion of 25 October, which once again endangers peace and security, already so fragile, my delegation would like to recall the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 36/103 in December 1981. That Declaration makes crystal clear, in unambiguous language, the duties flowing from the principle of non-interference and non-intervention.

242. First, it is the duty of States

> "to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever to violate the existing internationally recognized boundaries of another State, to disrupt the political, social or economic order of other States, to overthrow or change the political system of another State or its Government, to cause tension between or among States or to deprive peoples of their national identity or cultural heritage".

243. Secondly, it is the duty of a State

> "to refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any other form of intervention and interference, overt or covert, directed at another State or group of States, or any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of another State, including acts of reprisal involving the use of force".

244. Thirdly, it is the duty of a State

> "to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form or under whatever pretext to destabilize or to undermine the stability of another State or any of its institutions".

245. My country, Guinea-Bissau, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, is faithful to these principles and believes that any foreign aggression against a sovereign State is a flagrant violation of international norms and shows complete disregard of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter of the United Nations.

246. The tragic developments that have brought such bloodshed to the sovereign State of Grenada through aggression and occupation by foreign forces, which can in

no circumstances be justified, have serious consequences for the maintenance of international peace and security. We believe that this foreign intervention is a serious and dangerous development and that such military action leads to the development of new hotbeds of tension and greater instability in the Caribbean region.

247. The Republic of Guinea-Bissau strongly condemns the act of aggression committed against Grenada and calls for the immediate cessation of this intervention and the unconditional withdrawal of all foreign forces from that country. In this spirit of solidarity the delegation of Guinea-Bissau fully supports the draft resolution sponsored by Guyana, Nicaragua and Zimbabwe.

248. In conclusion, I should like to express the sympathy and the solidarity of the Government and the people of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau to the people of Grenada in this time of trial.

249. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Afghanistan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

250. Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): First of all, I should like, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. May I also congratulate your predecessor, the representative of Guyana, on the manner in which he guided the work of the Council during September. I also wish to thank you and, through you, the other members of the Council for having afforded my delegation the opportunity to participate in the Council's discussion on the situation in Grenada.

251. The Council is seized of a situation which constitutes the gravest of breaches of every basic norm of international legality and morality.

252. In response to the overwhelming desire of nations for peaceful relations and the prevention of war and destruction, the drafters of the Charter of the United Nations attempted to formulate principles and rules that would guide future international relations. Thus the noble ideas which had stood the test of man's experience throughout history were selected to be adhered to and strictly observed by all nations choosing to join the Organization. Having assumed the form of an organization of all sovereign States, the United Nations has since its inception tirelessly endeavoured to formulate instruments that would govern inter-State relations in a wide variety of fields. By virtue of their special status under the Charter, the five permanent members of the Security Council were assigned special responsibilities as guardians of the Charter principles.

253. The world was outraged by the news that a very small island nation in the Caribbean had become a victim of inhuman and barbaric aggression by the biggest imperialist monster, a permanent member of the Council. Manipulating the internal developments in Grenada, the United States had been preparing for an overt military attack to topple whatever would be left of the revolutionary order in that country.

254. What are at stake now are some of the most vital principles constituting the backbone of international relations, namely, those of non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, the inadmissibility of the use or threat of use of force in international relations, respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States, respect for the right of all nations to choose their own socio-economic systems, peaceful coexistence among nations, the inviolability of the internationally recognized frontiers of States, and so on.

255. United States officials, in a vain attempt to justify their brutal and cowardly action against the people of Grenada, have advanced a few flimsy arguments, which I should like to discuss here.

256. First, they said that the invasion of Grenada was necessary in order to protect the lives of some 1,000 American citizens. Was it not the President of the United States himself who announced only the day before the invasion that the lives of United States citizens, among them the medical students, were in no danger? He stated this while final preparations for the invasion were already in progress. Two days ago the individual most concerned with the safety of the students, namely, the Chancellor of St. George's Medical College, stated uniquivocally that on the basis of many reports and much information he had received, including some direct contacts with the students on the island and United States diplomats in the region, there was no reason to believe that any danger was threatening the security or the lives of the students. The Grenadian authorities had also assured visiting American diplomats that all United States citizens would be under their protection and that, if requested, they would facilitate the safe evacuation of all United States citizens who wished to leave the island. The mask of concern for the safety of United States citizens, therefore, cannot cover the ugly face of this American act of lawlessness.

257. Secondly, we were told that they had intervened in Grenada to forestall further chaos and establish law and order. One might have considered the possibility that bad advice or ignorance had led the President of the United States to believe that Grenada was one of the States of the United States. But we have seen high-ranking United States officials pointing at the location of Grenada on the map and now and then referring to it as a country. That being the case, is it then ignorance of international law that led to the ruthless invasion by the United States?

258. We know for a fact that the United States does not subscribe to some of the international instruments codifying the cardinal principles I have mentioned, but there remain many other instruments to which the United States is a party and of which it was a co-author. The Charter of the United Nations and that of the OAS stipulate that to forestall further chaos and establish law and order in one country is no business of any other country. That machiavellian pretext, therefore, loses its validity before international law.

259. Thirdly, we were told to believe that they invaded Grenada to restore democratic institutions in that country. Since when, one may ask, has the United States acquired the right to prescribe political and social systems for other nations?

260. The demagogic hue and cry with regard to democracy à la Washington notwithstanding, has any nation the right under international law to invade another country and install the social system of its liking? Is it not the people of a country who have the sole authority to decide on their own future? Here again, we do not believe that the pretext advanced by the highest United States official resulted from this ignorance of the most fundamental principles of international law.

261. Fourthly, they said—and it was later echoed by certain subservient leaders—that internal developments in Grenada posed a threat to the security of the United States and other countries in the area. This argument is particularly surprising, the more so when it is stated by the ruler of probably the most powerful nation on earth. Even through analysis of the carefully selected news reports in the United States press monopolies, one hardly gains the impression that there was any threat from the purely internal developments in Grenada to the security of the United States or other countries of the region. The unfortunate internal developments in Grenada on the eve of the invasion can in no way serve as a pretext for the American act of banditry against that country.

262. Fifthly, with sheer arrogance and hypocrisy, we were asked to believe that the United States invasion was at the request of a number of countries in that area. To portray the "invitation" as legal, article 8 of the 1981 Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States was invoked. Even a glance at this article would suffice to establish that the collective defence and security measures stipulated there were meant to safeguard the countries of the area against external aggression, and to adopt such measures there must be a unanimous decision of member countries. In the first place, the authorities in Grenada were not invited to the meeting where discussion of the internal events in that country took place. There existed no external aggression, other than that perpetrated by the United States aggressors, which would have prompted a joint action by the OECS countries. No request was made by the Grenadian authorities for assistance from the OECS or from the United States. The United States is not a party to the OECS treaty of 1981. Therefore, the United States has neither rights nor obligations under that treaty.

263. The only regional treaty which governs the relations between the United States and Grenada is the Charter of the Organization of American States. Article 21 of that charter strictly prohibits the use of force under any pretext whatsoever by member States against each other.

264. Based on those reasons, the unlawful decision of the six member countries of the OECS does not provide a legal basis for the launching of aggression by them, or by the United States for that matter.

265. Sixthly, there has also been talk of a multinational force. No matter how disappointed we are with the accomplices of the shameless American military attack, it can in no way help to disguise the imperialist and neo-colonialist nature of the invasion in which 95 per cent of the troops participating were from the United States armed forces. Aggression is aggression even under any other name, uninational or multinational and thus unjustifiable under international law.

266. Taking into consideration these and many other factual aspects of the situation, what has happened constitutes a flagrant violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. This blatant aggression has given legitimate cause for grave concern among small and independent countries who wish to maintain their independence and sovereignty. As the representative of Guyana, Mr. Sinclair, stated at the extraordinary meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, today it is Grenada, tomorrow it will be Guyana, and the next day some other country.

267. The urgency of the matter requires that the Security Council adopt, as soon as possible, effective measures to put an end to the aggression against the people of Grenada and to demand the immediate withdrawal of aggressive forces from that country. In order to prevent occurrence of similar actions by the United States it is necessary to condemn that nation, in the strongest possible terms, for its act of aggression against Grenada.

268. We hail the heroic struggle and resistance of the Grenadian people against the United States forces of invasion. The delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan expresses its firm solidarity with them and with other nations of the region, particularly Cuba, Nicaragua, Suriname and Guyana, who have recently become targets of political, economic and military pressure and provocation from United States imperialism.

269. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Guatemala. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

270. Mr. QUIÑONES-AMÉZQUITA (Guatemela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, the delegation of Guatemala wishes to congratulate you on having assumed the presidency of the Security Council. We believe that your knowledge and the shrewd competence with which you are guiding these debates augur well for the work of the Council. I thank the Security Council for having allowed me to speak on this matter.

271. I have precise instructions from the Ministry of External Relations of Guatemala to state the following. My country views with concern the events that have occurred in Grenada, where forces of various countries of the Caribbean, with the assistance of the United States of America, have landed, having invoked as basic reasons for their action the protection of citizens, a state of anarchy, the non-existence of a government recognized by the inter-

national community, and the collective security of the region.

272. Faced with the *de facto* situation, Guatemala takes an attitude of understanding for the various reasons put forward, but we state that we cannot favour, encourage, justify or support this type of intervention by violent means. The main responsibility for what is taking place in Grenada falls on the shoulders of those who sought to impose a Government without popular support and who prevented the holding of elections, which appeared to be the desire of the Government of Mr. Bishop. That responsibility falls also on the shoulders of those who propagate principles of self-determination but who use that term to mean extracting a country from one sphere of economic influence to place it into another, and who justify the perpetuation of power by putting forward the principle of the need for development without consulting the people and who intervene in the internal affairs of other countries using new means of aggression, not yet regulated by international law, which serve as spearheads for imposing their principles and their hegemony.

273. Only votes confer legitimacy, and only when they are cast in free and pluralist elections. That is why we hope that, as an act which is an inherent part of sovereignty, the people of Grenada will be able promptly to determine its own future through free elections.

274. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

275. Mr. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the other members of the Council for having been so kind as to accede to the request of the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago to participate in this debate. Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. My delegation is confident that your vast experience and skill, particularly in the United Nations system, will contribute to a balanced and successful outcome to these deliberations. Our thanks are also due to Mr. Sinclair of Guyana, who presided over the Council in September.

276. I should like to outline the position of the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago on the unprecedented, ominous and tragic events which have overtaken Grenada in the last few weeks. These events have shocked the world not only because of the horror of the brutal execution of the Prime Minister, Mr. Maurice Bishop, of several of his cabinet Ministers, of trade union leaders and of civilians, but also because such events are without precedent in the Commonwealth Caribbean.

277. On learning of those deaths, the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, as current Chairman of CARICOM, consulted with other CARICOM leaders and agreed to act as host to an emergency meeting of the heads of 12 CARICOM States in Port of Spain on 22 and 23 October in order to discuss the Grenada situation and the action which those States might take in order to ensure the restoration of normalcy in Grenada.

278. At the same time, and without prejudice to any decision that might emanate from such a meeting, the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago took an independent decision to institute certain measures with respect to its trade and other relations with Grenada. These were that Trinidad and Tobago would not participate in any CARICOM meetings whatsoever at which Grenada would be present; that no Grenada citizens or nationals would be allowed entry into Trinidad and Tobago without a visa; that no exports from Grenada into Trinidad and Tobago would be afforded CARICOM treatment and that no vessels registered in Grenada would be allowed the facilities of the CARICOM jetty in Trinidad and Tobago. Additionally the Government resolved to take such steps as were necessary to protect the safety of Trinidad and Tobago nationals in Grenada.

279. The emergency meeting of CARICOM just alluded to took place as planned in Port of Spain. At that meeting proposals were advanced which were consistent with Trinidad and Tobago's foreign policy and which were based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to which we fully subscribe. Among the fundamental elements of that policy are the principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the non-use of force in the conduct of international relations and in the settlement of disputes. The proposals discussed were, first, that there would be no involvement of any external elements in the resolution of the Grenada situation; secondly, that the resolution of the Grenada situation should be wholly regional, that is to say CARICOM in nature; thirdly, that the regional solution pursued should not violate international law or the Charter of the United Nations; and, fourthly, that any proposed solution should have as its primary purpose the restoration of normalcy in Grenada.

280. In addition, certain measures were proposed precisely for the restoration of normalcy in Grenada. These were as follows: the Governor-General, as the legal representative of the Queen, the head of State, should be used as the point of contact in Grenada; through contact with the Governor-General a broad-based civilian Government of national reconciliation whose composition was acceptable to him should be established, and a primary function of that Government would be the putting into place of arrangements for the holding of elections at the earliest possible date; acceptance of a fact-finding mission comprising eminent CARICOM nationals; the putting into place of arrangements to ensure the safety of nationals of other countries in Grenada, and/or their evacuation, where desired; and the acceptance of the deployment in Grenada of a peace-keeping force comprising contingents from CARICOM countries.

281. However, as a result of developments in Grenada over the last few days, further action on these proposals has not been possible. It is now public knowledge that military forces have landed in Grenada and are currently engaged in hostilities there. In this connection I wish to

inform the Council that the first and only official notification to the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago about the landing of forces in Grenada was sent to him several hours after the actual landing.

282. The situation in Grenada as it stands today is most delicate and poses a grave threat to the peace and stability of the region.

283. During the general debate at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, at the 18th meeting, the Minister of External Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago appealed to all States to desist from seeking to impose any settlement of disputes by the use or threat of the use of force and to exercise due respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all individual States. He further appealed against the importation of foreign rivalries, conflicts and tensions into the Caribbean. He expressed the hope that the Caribbean area would remain a zone of peace in which peaceful and amicable solutions would continue to be found to the problems of the area.

284. Further, it should be noted that at meetings of the heads of Government of CARICOM in Ocho Rios in 1982 and again in Port of Spain in July 1983, specific decisions were taken against the use of force in the settlement of disputes. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago, as a party to these decisions, could therefore not depart from these agreed principles, particularly without resort, in the first instance, to efforts at a peaceful solution of the problem.

285. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago considers it most unfortunate that efforts to resolve the Grenada situation could not have been peaceful and regional in nature. The Government maintains its original position on this matter and continues to hold firmly to that view. It is regrettable that a solution involving the non-use of force, proposed during the emergency meeting of the CARICOM heads of Government, was not pursued. It is regrettable that a solution of a purely CARICOM nature was not agreed upon and was not pursued. It is regettable that as a first resort measures involving the use of force have been embarked upon and that military intervention of this nature has been imported into the Commonwealth Caribbean.

286. In the present situation and in pursuance of its original objectives, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago remains committed to pursuing a course of action that will result in: first, the earliest possible withdrawal of combat forces in Grenada; secondly, the earliest establishment there, through appropriate channels, of a CARICOM peace-keeping presence in which we are prepared to participate—in this regard we wish to emphasize a clear distinction between the role of an occupation force and that of a peace-keeping force; thirdly, the establishment of a broad-based civilian Government, the primary function of which would be the earliest putting into place of arrangements for holding free and fair elections: fourthly, the establishment of a fact-finding mission comprising eminent nationals of CARICOM States; fifthly, the restoration of normalcy in Grenada; and sixthly, the preservation of the unity of the Caribbean Community.

287. My delegation has highlighted for the Council's benefit the position of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, fully elaborated by Mr. George Chambers, Prime Minister, in a statement on this question before Parliament on Wednesday, 26 October.

288. The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago deeply sympathieses with the people of Grenada in what is obviously a most troubled time not only for them but for the region as a whole. It expresses the hope that the Council in its deliberations will take account of the objectives and proposals enunciated and will focus on the alleviation of the plight of the people of Grenada. In this connection, the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reiterates its readiness to assist in a resolution of the crisis in accordance with the stated principles.

289. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Security Council has extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

290. Mr. MAKSOUD (League of Arab States): Mr. President, I should like to express to you and, through you, to the other members of the Security Council the deep appreciation of the League of Arab States for allowing me to address the Council on a very vital issue of principle, and of behaviour. Let me at the outset express to you, Sir, well-deserved congratulations. You have been known throughout your illustrious career for your wisdom, your restraint, your commitment to the objectives of the Charter of the United Nations.

291. Turning to the subject of this meeting, I would first state the *locus standi*: why we are interested in this great debate. People might say that, logically, we are geopolitically somewhat distant from the area of the Caribbean. This is a matter in which the super-Powers are involved. And yet we feel a need to have our input factored into this debate. For the League of Arab States, too, is a regional organization. Our member States are interwoven as one people, to use the terminology of the representative of Saint Lucia. Yet we too submit that this concept of national destiny and unity and oneness of purpose, of culture and of people, does not warrant at any juncture the violation of the sovereignty of our member States, even within the context of the regional organization.

292. Therefore, the notion, the precedent, the pattern of behaviour that have been introduced in the past few days concern us deeply. If all this is allowed to go unchecked, it can lead to a process of destabilization that can infect many regions of the world.

293. Furthermore, we are fascinated by the thesis advanced this evening by the representative of the United States—the thesis that the prohibition of the use of force is contextual and not absolute. This is a very interesting thesis, and I think it is necessary for the Council to examine it—especially when it is juxtaposed with the original thesis that Mr. Kissinger expounded last Sunday in connection

with another region; namely, that the United States has the right to intervene, with another ally—Israel—in Lebanon to redress the balance of political forces, in consonance with the interests of the United States.

294. Now here we are bordering on dangerous ground; we are legitimizing—if we accept these theses taken together—intervention, we are in fact allowing counter-legitimacy to become the new legitimacy.

295. What is the meaning? That the notion and the theory of non-intervention is not absolute but contextual. If it is contextual, it means that it should be put in a context. Therefore it is relative; it is subject to interpretation; it allows subjective policies to be marketed as objective realities; it legitimizes the use of force; it allows intervention; it reverses the whole jurisprudence of the Charter of the United Nations; it establishes a precedent that, if allowed to go unchecked, would let irrational forces loose on the world community and would require a total revision of the international equation and international jurisprudence.

296. Needless to say, what we have heard today—the eagerness to follow the principles of international law, to acquiesce in the Charter, to respect the mechanism of the United Nations—naturally many of these are ideals that cannot be obtained. Although we all profess commitment to international law and principle, we do not always follow them meticulously, but at least the Charter and the principles of international law, although they might not be as binding as they ought to be, constitute guidelines for our whole behaviour and they condition a great deal of our international relations.

297. Therefore what has taken place in Grenada raises, as the representative of the United States has rightly stated, many issues of principle and many values. Yet it is not important to use the terms principles and values, because they too are subject to interpretation. What is necessary is that we must allow a broad spectrum of opinion, that constitutes the definition of international consensus, to be the principal guide for deliberations, resolutions and international relations.

298. Therefore we in the League of Arab States and the Arab nation and, I suppose, throughout the entire third world, realize that the notion of what constitutes legitimacy is an important aspect of all international endeavours. In this respect, we have found that in Grenada the Prime Minister was executed together with many members of his Cabinet. There is no doubt that this form of internal behaviour, by whoever it might be and whatever might be the reasoning, constitutes a basic violation and an erosion of legitimacy. We share in the universal condemnation of this act of deliberate violence and the removal of members of the Cabinet of the Grenadian Government. It is true, as those invading forces have sought to vindicate, that a certain political vacuum did develop; there developed also an institutional vacancy, which could be accountable to all sorts of behaviour.

299. Yet the question that arises and perhaps the dilemma that confronts the international community at this juncture is—does an invasion fill up an institutional vacancy? Does an invasion constitute the filling of a gap which enables it to treat itself as a substitute for the accountability of a régime or a government in Grenada? The answer is definitely no, because invasion cannot be an instrument of policing the destiny of any State or any society. If there is a vacuum, would it not have been in the interest of mankind and of peace in the world for those in the region to have sought to fill that vacuum by exhausing all political and diplomatic means available to the region, in the context of the United Nations and of the Security Council? Would it not have been in the interests of international peace and understanding to have resorted to the mechanism of the United Nations in order either to fill an institutional vacuum or at least to redeem and buffer whatever anarchy might develop in the aftermath of the butchery that has taken place?

300. Yet under no circumstances can an invasion be vindicated or justified, even the pretence of interfering and invading, because either an absence of authority or the protection of citizens does not warrant this precipitate jump into the vacuum. Therefore we find a near universal condemnation of the invasion, because it sets a very dangerous precedent, because it does not exhaust the regional means available and the means available in the OAS and in the United Nations. It looks as if the vacuum was awaited in order to be filled by an interfering and intervening invasion force. That is why it is totally intolerable.

301. Furthermore, we are dealing with an issue of grave danger to world peace, because we see that any internal problem, any internal political crisis, any question of violation or fermentation in any third-world country is transforming the third-world countries that have sought to remain independent and to protect their sovereignty into arenas where super-Power accounts can be settled in localized areas. This is the danger: the polarization that is eroding the internal mobility of regional organizations, and undermining the sovereign right of independence and the sovereign territorial integrity of nations, and it constitutes an initial step bringing us to the brink and allowing any internal problem in any part of the world to bring the super-Powers to the brink of confrontation. This is where the non-aligned countries and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to which the Arab States and the Arab League belong, realize that they must not allow their internal processes, however negative or positive, however orderly or anarchical they might be, to be transformed into excuses for the projection of polarization and for the projection of the super-Powers into the internal affairs of various States of the third world.

302. It is in this respect the deep concern of the third-world countries and societies, when they find a super-Power using invasion as a pretext to project its power by projecting every issue in terms of East-West or super-Power confrontations. That is why we in the Arab world know full well that those who are advocating self-determination for the people of Grenada—and we support this right of self-determination—should not assume the double standard that they apply when it comes to the self-determination of the Palestinian people. And therefore

when the invasion of Lebanon by Israel becomes absolved by the subsequent invasion in Grenada we know that that is playing havoc with sovereignty and independence and the future of stability and peace in the world.

303. That is why the issues that have arisen today in the Security Council go far beyond the unfortunate crisis of violence in the State of Grenada. They go far beyond even regional concerns because they touch deeply on the future of the notion of sovereignty and the values of independence and because they allow once and for all polarization between the super-Powers to frustrate the ability and the mobility of other countries that are not super-Powers to move freely and to exercise their sovereignty and to bring about the relaxation of international tension. But if every issue internally, in every part of the world, is going to be viewed exclusively in terms of super-Power confrontation, then the arena might be in countries like Grenada or other countries of the third world today, but they might become ominous in terms of confrontation on a real scale. That is why, although the third world countries, and Grenada in particular, today might be the victims of a struggle on a very super-Power level, this can be a dangerous precedent for us in the Middle East, for the peoples of Central America, for the peoples of Africa. In Namibia, for example, we find that every issue is projected in the East-West confrontation context.

304. I know that we are all concerned. We have to reconcile difficult options. The option of legitimacy cannot be imposed by means of invasion, by the intervention of a super-Power, because then whatever legitimacy might arise becomes illegitimate. It is important that the usurpation of the powers of the international community should not become a precedent that can be pursued without challenge. It must be challenged during the deliberations and in the resolution of this Council.

305. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Zambia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

306. Mr. LUSAKA (Zambia): Mr. President, my delegation is grateful to you and the other members of the Security Council for allowing us to take part in the debate on the situation in Grenada. We have asked to participate in order to make clear Zambia's position on the invasion of Grenada by the United States under the guise of a so-called multinational force.

307. I wish, accordingly, to read out to the Council the text of a statement issued by my Government on the invasion:

> "Zambia strongly disapproves and unreservedly condemns the invasion of the independent State of Grenada by United States forces and their Caribbean collaborators.
>
> "Zambia regards the invasion of Grenada not only as a flagrant violation of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Grenada but also as a blatant disregard of international law and practice. Only recently, Zambia had strongly condemned the callous murder of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, and Zambia cannot now condone a similar act of violence by outside forces against the people of Grenada.
>
> "The action of the United States and its allies is morally indefensible and not consistent with the tenets of the Charter of the United Nations, which guide proper international conduct. Zambia does not accept the argument that an invitation to the United States from certain Caribbean States to act against another sovereign Caribbean State justified the invasion. To accept such reasoning would be tantamount to giving licence to any country or group of countries which has or have grievances against another to extend an invitation to any powerful nation to invade such other country. The small and weak countries can have no security assured for them in such a state of affairs.
>
> "No country in the world, however big and powerful, has the right to impose its will on another sovereign State.
>
> "It is in this context that Zambia calls upon the United States and its allies to withdraw forthwith their invasion forces from Grenada and leave the people of Grenada to resolve their problems without outside coercion, intimidation or any other form of pressure."

308. I can only add that my Government is closely following the deliberations of the Security Council on this grave situation and hopes that the Council will be able to live up to its responsibilities. The Council should condemn the invasion of Grenada in no uncertain terms and call for the immediate withdrawal of the so-called multinational force from that country. The Council is today the focus of international attention on this matter.

309. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Colombia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

310. Mr. ALBÁN-HOLGUÍN (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the members of the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in this debate. We are pleased to see as President of the Council a person of your calibre and experience. We are sure that in these difficult times you will guide the debate with decisiveness and prudence.

311. The position of Colombia in relation to this particular matter is based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the charter of the Organization of American States, and on the generally accepted principles of international law. The actions with which we are concerned violate these principles and also those which appear in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,[1] unanimously adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session, which states in one of its relevant

sections: "Every State has the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples ... of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence." The resolution also states: "No State ... has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State." The intervention, whatever it may be, of a State in the internal affairs of another State, under any pretext, however important it might be deemed to be, cannot be accepted.

312. I believe it is not incorrect to assert that the stunned reaction of the citizens of Grenada to the events that occurred in their territory is similar to that felt by the people of the United States, for example, when Pearl Harbour, in the Hawaiian Islands, was attacked on Sunday, 7 December 1941, and by the people of Afghanistan on 25 December 1979.

313. These are facts which disturb the world because they constitute flagrant violations of the basic principles of international law on which international peace and security are based. But the impression persists that these countries have become mere pawns on the chessboard of the major Powers.

314. The greatness of a country does not begin nor does it rest on its extraordinary economic development, nor on the power of its weapons, but in its aspirations for freedom and in its respect of those principles which make international coexistence possible. It is not impressive consumer power nor material wealth which projects an image of respectability beyond its borders, but the moral fibre of its people who are proud of its behaviour, and an institutional organization which inspires faith in democracy and freedom. The mission of a nation for the future is the progressive development of its virtues and culture.

315. From its very inception Colombia has had a vocation for the law, confirmed throughout the vicissitudes of its history and a deep-rooted faith in what is right and legal, an environment in which the individual and States may improve their relations and settle their differences without damaging peace.

316. Facts tell us that ours are times of frustration and regression. A poor contribution would be made to a world anxious for solutions which would free it from fear, pain and poverty when, on the threshold of the year 2000, we still give validity to those ideas which accept that might is right and that it is the decisive instrument for the settlement of disputes.

317. Never before has humankind, daily threatened by a nuclear catastrophe, been in greater need of concrete facts which will ensure it against a return to barbarism. It is necessary, indeed essential, that international law be respected. Weak nations and defenceless peoples want to know that they are protected by their membership in the international community. They wish to preserve their independence and their sovereignty; they are anxious to prosper, to create more egalitarian societies and to decide on and achieve their own destiny.

318. When we are deciding on the fate of this planet—in which, according to the President of Colombia, Mr. Belisario Betancur, "As we ascend to gaze more closely into the face of God we become more truly equidistant from any given point on earth"[4]—attitudes such as these cannot be understood. The great Powers appear to be involved in daily battles. Surrounded on every side by imperialism, our bewildered peoples unhesitantingly look to the law for international protection and for respect of their human rights.

319. Colombia feels a moral obligation, as was stated by President Betancur, to affirm that it is urgent and necessary that foreign military troops and advisers withdraw from Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Namibia, Mozambique, Angola and Chad and from any other part of the world in which the self-determination of peoples is thwarted.

320. What is important is to foster, urgently and openly, the development of peoples and to place them in a position to keep on developing. It is necessary that neither chaos, violence and disorder, but the best traditions of the civilization to which we belong should prevail in the hemisphere. We must not lack faith to embark, within freedom, on procedures which will consolidate the defence of democratic institutions. Economic development is the only war which we should declare, a war which, in the words of an eminent writer, has no other enemy than poverty, uncertainty and helplessness. The worthwhile adventure of development will make us a continent of peoples united in essential matters which will contribute to peace in the world.

321. Colombia, once again, comes to the defence of the principle enshrined in the charter of our continental system which it has practised with deep faith, that of non-intervention, the bases of which are well known to members of this Council. That principle is fundamental for peace in America and its undermining would produce grave upheavals. This also explains our deep concern at what we view as an erroneous breach in the solidarity that we have practised to ensure that no Power whatsoever should flaunt in our area its designs for influence and world power.

322. My delegation wishes to read the communiqué issued by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. It reads:

> "The Government of Colombia notes with deep concern the act of force undertaken yesterday in the island of Grenada by military units of the United States, accompanied by contingents of some Caribbean countries. Colombia rejects the use of force in international relations and therefore condemns this act of blatant intervention in a country which recently has been affected by violent situations which ended with the overthrow and the unspeakable murder of the Prime Minister, Maurice Bishop, and several of his colleagues by a group of military and civilian extremists.
>
> "Gatherings such as the Contadora Group have requested third countries to abstain from intervening

directly or indirectly in the internal affairs of other States and have insisted on respect for the principles of non-intervention and self-determination of peoples enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the Organization of American States, the complete observance of which is absolutely crucial for guaranteeing stable and lasting peace.

"Colombia considers that armed occupation of the island is unjustifiable and hopes that the military forces of the United States and other countries will withdraw immediately and that the same will be done by the Soviet and Cuban advisers, all of which is indispensable for the re-establishment of internal order, democracy human rights and peace in Grenada."

323. Finally, Mr. President, I wish to inform you and the members of the Security Council that the President of Colombia and President Felipe González of Spain have initiated humanitarian measures so that the Cuban workers in Grenada may soon leave that island for home, as may those people of that nation who wish to seek refuge in other countries. These steps are being taken for purely humanitarian reasons, with the patronage of the United States authorities. In this way Colombia believes, along with Spain, that it can contribute to a prompt re-establishment of normality in Grenada.

324. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

325. Mr. TONEY (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption to the Council presidency and on the excellent manner in which you are conducting its affairs. I wish to thank you and the other members for permitting me to address the Council on the important matter before us, the situation in Grenada.

326. The delegation of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines wishes to associate itself fully with the statement made by the Prime Minister of Dominica, Chairperson of the OECS, on behalf of the member countries of the OECS.

327. The events which have taken place in Grenada are of grave concern to the Government and people of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. The situation in Grenada arising out of the overthrow of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and the subsequent brutal killing of Mr. Bishop, members of his cabinent and other citizens created conditions which posed a serious and immediate threat to the security of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. The refugees from Grenada who began to build up in the southernmost islands of the Grenadines were a matter of grave concern to the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. This signalled fear and insecurity within the community and the general deterioration of public order.

328. The severity of the curfew imposed on Grenada convinced the member States of the OECS that the existing régime was unstable and its conduct unpredictable. We feared not only later reprisals that would have been imposed *en masse* against defenceless citizens of Grenada, but that régime's ability to act aggressively against our own national interests. The indiscriminate mass killings were an outrage to decency and demanded, from a sense of morality and out of a genuine desire to preserve peace and stability in the area, that such a brutal group, acting without any legitimacy, should be removed from the exercise of authority and that the people of Grenada, in those circumstances, should be given the right to determine within the democratic framework the type of government they wished.

329. The Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines was gravely concerned about the military buildup of armed forces in Grenada. This military might in the hands of the present group posed a serious threat to our security. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines has no army. We share a common maritime border with Grenada.

330. It is our view that urgent collective action had to be taken. As a result of the imposition of a 96-hour shoot-on-site curfew, the killings, the demonstration of the brutality and ruthlessness of the military régime, the apparent disintegration of governmental authority, and the distinct prospect for the spread of this violence into the neighbouring States, the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines agreed to participate in this humanitarian assistance to the people of Grenada.

331. Pursuant to the collective recognition within the OECS treaty, to which Grenada is a signatory, as well as for group association, the maintenance of peace, order and security within member States, and recognizing our limited human and logistic capability, we sought the assistance of friendly Governments. The Governments of Jamaica, Barbados and the United States responded to our request to form a multinational force for the purpose of undertaking a pre-emptive defensive action in order to remove this dangerous threat to peace and security in the sub-region and to establish a situation of normality in Grenada.

332. The Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines gives the assurance that once the threat has been removed, the Governor-General of Grenada, the legal representative of the head of State, will be invited to assume executive authority over the country under the provisions of the Grenada Constitution of 1973 and appoint a broad-based interim Government to administer the country pending the holding of elections.

333. The OECS countries, all members may be assured, do not have expansionist ambitions. Motivated by the highest principles of altruism and morality, we would not have taken the course which we have pursued, except for the fact that we were convinced that there was no other believable option.

334. In conclusion, we feel confident that peace and prosperity can soon be restored to a free and democratic Grenada.

335. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Mongolia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

336. Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia): My delegation joins previous speakers in unanimously condemning the unprovoked armed aggression of the United States against the sovereign, independent and non-aligned State of Grenada as a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of contemporary international law. This act of aggression forms but a small part of the overall global strategy of American imperialism aimed at establishing its hegemony.

337. It is well known and documented that ever since the 13 March 1979 revolution, when the people of Grenada chose a path of socio-economic development, the United States has been trying to destabilize and overthrow the Government of Grenada. It is no secret that a spectre of overt and covert aggression against Grenada has been looming ever since 1979. The Government of Grenada and the Governments of many other countries time and again drew the attention of the international community to those ominous schemes and preparations. Thus, it was revealed that in Florida bands of mercenaries were being trained for this purpose. Only a few months ago the late Prime Minister Maurice Bishop again drew the world community's attention to the imminent danger of armed aggression.

338. Mongolia, like other countries, strongly condemns this barbaric act of imperialist aggression. The token participation of troops of some other neighbouring island States cannot conceal the fact that the main instigator, executor and beneficiary of this heinous act is American imperialism. The President, the Secretary of State and other United States officials have tried in vain to justify their aggression by invoking article 8 of the Treaty Establishing the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States. However, that article deals with situations of "external aggression", while it is recognized that no such danger existed and that neither Grenada nor anybody requested any assistance from other OECS countries or any other country. Furthermore, according to that article, the decision on collective action can be made only on the basis of full agreement among all the member States of that organization, that is, in unanimity. However, Grenada and some other member States were not consulted. On the contrary, a decision was imposed upon a group of island-States by the United States, which is not a member of that body.

339. By arbitrarily citing the treaty, the United States is indeed trampling upon the aspirations of peoples of that region to ensure collective security from external aggression. The aggression reveals the true nature of American imperialism and its attitude towards international law in general and international treaty obligations in particular. The United States is grossly violating its legal obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the charter of the Organization of American States—even assuming the right to declare certain treaty obligations "inapplicable".

340. As is well known to everyone, according to international law, no State has the right to commit acts of aggression or interfere in the internal affairs of others under any pretext. Therefore, all the reasons given by the United States Administration cannot justify the armed intervention. The alleged concern for the lives and safety of their citizens in Grenada is even more absurd, since the Government of Grenada in the last few days repeatedly reassured those concerned that the lives of the United States citizens were not in danger. Another reason given by the United States Administration was the restoration of law and order in that country. Who has given the United States Administration the right to police law and order in other countries? The only law and order that it is trying to restore is a colonial type, which has already been rejected by, among others, the people of Grenada.

341. The Mongolian people expresses its solidarity with the people of Grenada in these grim hours and its admiration for and solidarity with the Cuban workers and technicians who heroically fought the invaders for their life and ideals.

342. Mongolia views the attack on Grenada not only as an attack against a Caribbean or Latin American State, but also as an attack on the international community as a whole, fraught with the gravest danger for international peace and security.

343. I shall conclude my statement by quoting the following passage from a statement by Chairman Yumjagiin Tsedenbal:

> "The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic believes that the United States bears full responsibility for the violation of Grenada's sovereignty. The Mongolian People's Republic joins its voice to the demands of the peaceful public that all interventionist troops of foreign States be immediately withdrawn from the territory of that State and that the Grenadian people be given the possibility to resolve their internal problems themselves. The aggression against Grenada has a direct link with the American Administration's adventurist actions against the Republic of Cuba and Nicaragua. Having staged the barbarous armed attack on Grenada, the Reagan Administration dangerously aggravates the tense situation in the region and gravely imperils world peace. In this connection, the Mongolian People's Republic believes that the world community should take urgent and efficient steps to stop that insolent aggression of the United States."

344. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Mozambique. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

345. Mr. dos SANTOS (Mozambique): I have a prepared statement to make concerning the question under discussion, but since Colombia has on several occasions mentioned the name of my country, once during the general debate in the General Assembly and again tonight, I want to thank Colombia most sincerely for its love for and preoccupation with Mozambique. I wish to reassure Colombia, however, that its preoccupation with my country may be overdone.

346. I am grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the Council for affording me this opportunity to address this

important body of the United Nations family. Your experience, Sir, and the serene manner in which you have been conducting the Council's affairs are very reassuring to us. Coming from a country, a nation and a region that have not been able to taste peace in the past 35 years or so, you are in a good position to understand the anguish that has invaded us in the last 72 years. Allow me to add my frail but firm voice to those that have preceded me in order to say a word or two, for my frailty allows me no more than that.

347. It is frightening and disturbing for a small and weak—but proud—nation like mine to entertain the thought of the full consequences of what is happening in Grenada. The overwhelming majority of States composing the United Nations are in that category. Others, although equally proud, are even smaller and weaker than mine. Grenada is a case in point.

348. In Mozambique there are 12 million people inhabiting a territory of 780,000 square kilometres. There are at least 226 million Americans in an area of at least 3.5 million square miles, and the territory populated by the 110,000 Grenadines is only 344 square kilometres in area. I am told that Grenadians do not take it lightly if one stretches out one's arms, for they think that one is measuring their country.

349. It is said that the more powerful one is, the more serene and the more accommodating one is. A boxer may be vicious in the ring, but outside it he could never lift his finger to harm a mosquito. This may be true as a rule, but there are painful exceptions.

350. In some States power begets power, and the more poweful one is, the less secure one feels. And the accumulation of destructive power for the sake of sheer accumulation becomes self-perpetuating and acquires a life of its own. This kind of power can intoxicate exactly the way alcohol does. Under the influence of alcohol a man can become anything—a doctor, a policeman, a legislator, a judge, a gendarme, an arbitrator, an umpire.

351. Once upon a time there was a deranged doctor who thought that he could cure the evils, all and sundry, of this one world of ours. His prescription was always the same: whatever the malady, from a toothache to a scratch, from an ulcer to a broken limb, he prescribed an amputation. Needless to say, the remedy was more often than not worse than the illness itself. As an economist and a political scientist it was his desire that all countries should follow the same blueprint, prepared by him, of course. As a legislator he saw to it that all the rules of the game were set according to his whims and wishes, and during the game he could change them if he saw that his interests—and his interests alone—were better served that way. As an umpire he saw to it that the rules were strictly observed, by others of course. He was also at the same time both prosecutor and judge. His judgement was final and admitted of no recourse. As a gendarme and a policeman he made sure that the streets of the world were perfectly safe for himself.

352. Despite all these powers, this man feels himself ever more insecure. Everything threatens his security—a book here, a pamphlet there, a railway here and an airport there. When no scarecrow is available, a ghost is invented. A special dictionary was produced in which the word "democracy" means "dictatorship", the word "dictatorship", "democracy", and in which the expression "the tyranny of the majority" means "democracy" and the word "peace" means "destruction", "misery", "war", "death".

353. It is in this light that events should be viewed in Grenada. Events in Grenada were purely internal in nature and could in no way—I repeat: in no way—be construed as constituting a danger to Grenada's neighbours, must less to the United States. It was therefore up to the Grenadians to determine when and how to solve their problems and shape the future destiny of their nation, free from outside impediments and interference.

354. So insecure is this man that even his own shadow frightens him to death. How can one think even for a second that Grenada could pose a threat to a giant such as the United States of America? Grenada does not and cannot possibly represent the thin shadow of the United States. The other day some one was telling me, jokingly, that Grenada could not possibly pose any threat; for Grenadians to get out of their country they need American technical assistance.

355. This sense of insecurity reminds me of a practice very common among young Portuguese soldiers in Mozambique. Guerrillas made extensive use of the element of surprise coupled with constant and fast movement, so that young Portuguese soldiers quite often thought that the guerrillas disappeared as if by magic or turned themselves into monkeys. So members can imagine what used to happen: it was the monkeys and the footprints that suffered at the hands of the trigger-happy soldiers.

356. During the last hours events in Grenada took a sad and tragic turn. The United States decided to flex its muscles at the cost of hundreds of lives, whereas before the American intervention only a few lives had been lost. There is no justification whatever for that drastic course of action. What is the justification? It is a hypothetical threat to American lives, a claim of anarchy and a plea from puppets. None of this has been demonstrated. This act of removing a thorn from the throat of the United States is a political one. We are waiting for the day when the United States will move in to remove organized thuggery in South Africa, thus breaking the engagement before the marriage is consummated.

357. It is a tragic irony of history that the tragic events took place when the international community was celebrating United Nations Day and the General Assembly was debating the Kampuchean question; what irony indeed.

358. But there are other ironies. With the exception of one or two of the participating eastern Caribbean States, these countries have no armies; yet they have contributed men to the so-called multinational forces. What have they contributed besides their reprehensible political backing of the invasion? Are they soldiers? Soldiers they certainly cannot be. Are they watchmen or cooks?

359. The armed aggression, underwritten almost exclusively by the United States, offends law, decency and sense. It constitutes a blatant and unwarranted intervention in the internal affairs of Grenada and a brazen and gross violation of its territorial integrity and sovereignty. It flouts the most elementary and basic norms of international law and practice. It violates the most cherished mores of international behaviour and intercourse among civilized nations during these last years of the twentieth century.

360. The United States adventure in Grenada is an ominous sign and does not augur well for the developing world. The shark has been furious of late, and the sardines are in danger of being swallowed one by one. Grenada today, Suriname tomorrow, Nicaragua the day after tomorrow. Would there be any end to the wars fought to topple thugs?

361. The United Nations, and especially this Council, can do a lot to allay the fears of the developing countries and protect their right to follow the political and economic path of their choice without in any way being hindered or suffering aggression. The minimum that the Council can do is to see to it that all foreign forces are immediately and unconditionally withdrawn from Grenada. The Grenadian people have the right to demand that they be left alone, as they should be, in accordance with the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. Let the law of the jungle be banished for ever and ever.

362. I will conclude by reading the communiqué issued yesterday by the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique concerning events taking place in Grenada. It is as follows:

"The people and the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique have been following with great concern the dramatic events taking place in the Caribbean region, where troops from the United States and certain States of the region have invaded the small State of Grenada.

"Guided by its principles of peaceful coexistence, mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, sovereign equality and non-interference in internal affairs of other States—a policy that was reaffirmed once again by the Fourth Congress of the FRELIMO Party—the People's Republic of Mozambique considers that this invasion constitutes a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another State. It is a violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

"The Mozambique Government was shocked to learn of the death of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, a friend of the People's Republic of Mozambique. It deplores the wave of violence that led to assassination. However, the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique considers that the Grenadian people have the sovereign right to solve their own problems without external interference and free of any kind of intimidation. No State or group of States has the right to intervene militarily in another State without being expressly invited by the Government of the country concerned. Therefore, there are no reasons whatsoever, either legal or political, to justify this brutal action by the Governments in question, an action contrary to the most elementary norms of international law and ethics.

"In this context, the People's Republic of Mozambique cannot but condemn this aggression perpetrated by troops belonging to the United States and other countries of the region against the brotherly people and territory of Grenada. There will be security and lasting peace in the Caribbean and Central America only when all States in the region and ouside it, big or small, respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States of the region.

"The Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique and the Mozambican people render a profound homage to the memory of Maurice Bishop, a respected revolutionary and fighter for the Grenadian people whose honesty and political and moral integrity won him profound respect and admiration of people the world over. During the visit of the President of the People's Republic of Mozambique to Grenada in May of 1982, it was evident how Maurice Bishop was esteemed and loved by his people. The people and Government of Mozambique send their most heartfelt condolences to Maurice Bishop's aggrieved family as well as to his companions who lost their lives during the tragic events which took place in Grenada. The Government of Mozambique equally deplores the death of civilians as a consequence of the invasion perpetrated by foreign troops against this peaceful sovereign country. The People's Republic of Mozambique reiterates its solidarity and support to the people of Grenada. It demands all Governments in question to immediately and unconditionally withdraw their troops from the territory, so as to allow the Grenadian people to freely and effectively exercise their right to determine their own process of development and to solve alone their own problems."

363. Mr. van der STOEL (Netherlands): The Netherlands Government has taken note with deep concern of the recent developments in Grenada, arising out of the overthrow of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop's Government and the subsequent brutal killing of the Prime Minister and some of his cabinet colleagues as well as a number of other citizens.

364. My delegation has noted that the Governments of six eastern Caribbean countries perceived the developments in Grenada as a threat to the peace and security of the eastern Caribbean sub-region as a whole, and that these Governments made an urgent request to form a multinational force in order to remove this threat. Furthermore, my Government understands that there was concern for the safety and well-being of foreign citizens on Grenada.

365. Although we understand the concerns and preoccupations underlying this request, my delegation is of the view that the action taken cannot be considered compati-

ble with the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

366. It is for this reason thay my delegation will vote in favour of the resolution in its revised form. The people of Grenada must be able to exercise their fundamental right to self-determination, free from outside interference. We express the hope that that day will come soon.

367. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Czechoslovakia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

368. Mr. MURIN (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation I thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak at today's meeting of the Security Council to express Czechoslovakia's position on the open armed aggression of the United States against Grenada, a sovereign State Member of the United Nations.

369. The people and the Government of Czechoslovakia express profound indignation over the aggressive attack against peace-loving Grenada by interventionist troops of the United States. The insidious attack by imperialist forces represents a violation of the independence and territorial integrity of Grenada and is sharply at variance with the Charter of the United Nations and with the basic norms of international law. This act of open aggression is aimed not only at the suppression of the sovereign rights of the people of Grenada but also at the creation of a situation in which the United States would want to decide with impunity the fate of the peoples of Latin America and other parts of the world. The United States Administration bears full responsibility for this international crime, which not only increases tension in the region of Central America, but also poses a serious threat to world peace.

370. The United States has taken an openly hostile attitude towards the revolutionary process in Grenada from the very beginning. It organized subversive actions aimed at destabilizing the efforts of the Grenadian people to build a new society. It did not conceal the preparations for direct military intervention. The interventionists' aim is to stifle Grenada's revolutionary process, as well as fully to subordinate Central America and the Caribbean to imperialist and neo-colonialist rule.

371. The people and the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic resolutely condemn the armed aggression of the United States against Grenada and other actions directed against Cuba, Nicaragua and the national liberation struggle in Central America. They express their full solidarity with, and support for, the heroic struggle of the people of Grenada for the defence of their revolutionary achievements and for their right to decide their fate independently. They emphatically demand an immediate halt to the intervention and the withdrawal of all the occupying forces from Grenada. The Czechoslovak delegation demands most resolutely that the people of Grenada be guaranteed the speediest possible return to the free development that was begun for that country on 13 March 1979.

372. If the States Members of the United Nations do not resolutely condemn that act of open military aggression by the United States against Grenada and do not take effective measures to ensure the immediate withdrawal of the interventionist troops and the safeguarding of Grenada's full sovereignty, that lack of action may encourage the current United States Administration to commit further acts of aggression both on this continent and in other parts of the world.

373. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of the Dominican Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

374. Mr. KNIPPING VICTORIA (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, Mr. President, I should like, through you, to thank the members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to speak. I also wish to congratulate you, Sir, on the very serene, able and experienced way in which you are guiding the work of the Council during this discussion on a very delicate and important issue. I shall heed your cordial appeal and endeavour to be extremely brief.

375. The delegation of the Dominican Republic feels duty-bound to participate in this meeting of the Security Council, which is examining the recent events that have occurred in the Caribbean island of Grenada.

376. The Dominican Republic—which itself has suffered at various times since the beginning of its life as a republic the ignominy of having its honour, sovereignty and territorial integrity stained by the occupation of its soil by invading foreign troops—reaffirms in the clearest, most unequivocal and most categorical manner its unswerving traditional policy of scrupulous adherence to the fundamental norms and principles of international law.

377. In keeping with that steadfast course of conduct in Dominican foreign policy, expressed with the same fairness whenever those norms and principles are flouted, we deplore all the tragic events that have occurred in Grenada, events which have given rise to the violent death of its Prime Minister, eminent members of its Government and other persons. We deplore the fact that force has been used against the territorial integrity and political independence of that State in a way which is incompatible with the purposes of the United Nations and in open violation of the principles of non-intervention and the self-determination of peoples.

378. In conclusion, we express the hope that Grenada will recover its full normalcy as soon as possible and that its people will find the appropriate means to express its genuine political will peacefully and freely.

379. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of the United Republic of

Tanzania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

380. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, on 25 October, the day after the United Nations was marking its thirty-eighth anniversary, the world witnessed an act by a permanent member of the Security Council which defied one of the most fundamental principles of this Organization and international law. The United States of America, leading eight Caribbean States, carried out an invasion of a Member of the United Nations, resulting in widespread bloodshed and the loss of many lives.

381. That invasion was the culmination of successive ominous statements and unfounded allegations by the United States against the Government of Grenada. Although those statements were hostile enough to cause concern and attract the sympathy of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for Grenada in resisting efforts at destabilization directed against it, it was not easy to believe that the forces against that small island nation would go to the extent of so blatantly and openly invading it. The shock of the world community was compounded when the reasons for the invasion were given by the invading countries.

382. The Charter of the United Nations permits the use of force only in two sets of circumstances: first, when a country or a group of countries invites one or more countries to assist in individual or collective self-defence against armed external aggression; secondly, when the Security Council decides to take enforcement measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. None of those reasons was adduced. Instead, the world was treated to completely strange logic in justifying the invasion. We were told that the justifications of the armed intervention were (*a*) to evacuate citizens of the super-Power, and (*b*) to restore so-called democratic institutions in Grenada.

383. To this shock the world community understandably reacted without hesitation by categorically condemning that invasion. With the exception of those involved in the invasion, no country that has so far expressed itself on the question has endorsed that act of aggression. Indeed, speaker after speaker in the Council and every statement made outside this chamber have only confirmed the gross violation of the many international principles and norms which has been committed by the nine States—principles of the very Charter this Council stands for, principles of international law and obligations under treaties. The world community has rejected the flimsy legal and political arguments which have been advanced in justification of this act of aggression, which constitutes a dangerous and arrogant departure from international norms.

384. To defy the principles in the Charter which guarantee the territorial integrity and political independence of Member States is to reject some of the very basic purposes of the United Nations. It is to turn one's back against the desire of all peace-loving Members for world order and peace. It is to dismiss the Charter as an irrelevant document. If this kind of conduct is allowed, we should certainly ask ourselves seriously whether it is not the beginning of the disintegration of world society. For, if a Member can now be excused from observing such important norms of international conduct, is it not permission for any other Member to do the same, indeed anything in violation of such norms?

385. The question has been posed many times that if the world accepts the excuse given for the invasion of Grenada, how many States in the world can rest assured that they are not a target for the next invasion? And if these reasons for the invasion are admitted in spite of the total lack of justification under the Charter, can there not be other reasons available outside the Charter to justify invasions elsewhere? Can it be difficult to get such excuses for the many cases of differences between States of which we are all aware?

386. Today it is Grenada; tomorrow any one of us could face the same fate for the same reasons. Today it is to evacuate citizens and to restore so-called democratic institutions; tomorrow it could very well be to remove third-party nationals in other countries considered unacceptable or to change the domestic or foreign policies of those weak States—in other words, to restore régimes which are subservient to the invader and a socio-political system that is acceptable to the stronger. Today it is to prevent the construction of an airport allegedly capable of use for military purposes by a foreign Power; tomorrow it may very well be to prevent the expansion of a harbour, the construction of a railway or a building that is unilaterally and subjectively perceived capable of serving a military purpose. In other words, outside the Charter there is no end to imaginary rationalizations for such acts of aggression.

387. As we are discussing the horror of the invasion of Grenada, those of us who come from southern Africa cannot fail to see the encouragement this invasion has given to the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria. We cannot fail to reflect on the implications of this act of aggression coming from a Power that has pledged so-called constructive co-operation with that régime. Lacking any excuse for its unprovoked acts of aggression and destabilization against neighbouring States, the restless, racist and criminal régime of South Africa has always been in need of such examples by Members of the United Nations as a smokescreen behind which to hide. The invaders of Grenada have, regrettably, given that outcast régime consoling company.

388. The whole of Africa and all third-world countries must get the message of the Grenada invasion. There is no place in the third world which is remote from the military reach of any of the big Powers. After the invasion of Grenada, we must consider ourselves the next object of punishment for anything that offends a big Power that does not respect the Charter of the United Nations or international law.

389. The non-aligned countries must view this event as a very serious development. It cannot but be frustrating and worrying that some of its members have succumbed to the temptation of being used by one of the super-Powers in its ideological crusade in violent defiance of the cardinal prin-

ciples of the Movement. To undermine the Movement is to weaken and undercut one of the most important forces for world peace, justice, independence and the dignity of man.

390. My delegation finds it regrettable that in this case it has been the weak and the vulnerable who have found it necessary to involve themselves in this action. Today it is Grenada; tomorrow it may be Jamaica, Barbados, Dominica, Saint Lucia, Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines or Montserrat. For if military strength—either that possessed by ourselves or that which is placed at our disposal by our friends—were the means of our existence as independent and non-aligned countries, then I am afraid very few of us would ever continue to exist as independent States. We the weak derive strength in collective solidarity under the Charter. We have survived the whims and dislikes of those more powerful through the existence of the very principles which the invasion has violated.

391. My Government has already issued a statement rejecting this blatant act of aggression. Today we urge the Council to express the indignation of the international community. The gravity of the involvement of a permanent member of the Security Council in a crusade of lawlessness and piracy must be underlined. The Council must be categorical in condemning this act and call upon the United States and the eight Caribbean States to withdraw their invading forces immediately and respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Grenada.

392. We extend our condolences to the people of Grenada who have lost members of their families as a result of this invasion and occupation. We equally express our condolences to the Government of Cuba for the loss of its citizens who in solidarity with their brothers and sisters of Grenada chose to die rather than accept "protection" by aggression.

393. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Brazil, Chile and Singapore in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Trucco (Chile) and Mr. Koh (Singapore) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

394. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Chile. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

395. Mr. TRUCCO (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, I wish to thank you and the other members of the Council for having given me the opportunity of expressing the position of my country and my delegation with regard to the question now before the Council. I will be brief.

396. The Government and the delegation of Chile are following the events in Grenada with deep concern. For some time now a serious process of foreign infiltration and interference has been observed in that country. An exaggerated arms buildup, the establishment of a disproportionate naval and military infrastructure, the presence of Soviet and Cuban advisers and agents have constituted elements in a disquieting picture and a situation of danger and threat to the stability of other nations of the area. This led countries belonging to the OECS, along with Barbados, the United States of America and Jamaica, to adopt the decision to initiate action which the international community now knows about and deplores.

397. Chile is certain that the invasion would not have occurred had it not been for these developments.

398. My country has always opposed the use of force and interference in the internal affairs of other States. When questions have arisen concerning relations among countries of the hemisphere, we have always thought the best way of avoiding confrontation to be the timely recourse to precisely those mechanisms which the nations of the continent have agreed on in order to guarantee peace and order and the security of their peoples.

399. My country has repeatedly expressed in the United Nations its concern at the obvious lack of the will to seek by all possible means the peaceful settlement of disputes and the maintenance of international peace and security. For this reason it has insisted on the urgent need to devise formulas which would allow the United Nations to keep a close watch on the development of situations that could deteriorate so severely as to make Security Council action impossible or futile.

400. My delegation again expresses the hope that the tragic events affecting the American continent will give rise to the reaction necessary to ensure that the most fundamental principles of the law of nations are respected by all Member States, without any exception.

401. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Brazil. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

402. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): Mr. President, let me first express my appreciation to you and the other members of the Council for giving us the opportunity to express our views at this meeting of the Security Council.

403. Upon being informed about the recent events in Grenada, the Government of Brazil issued a note, distributed on 26 October as an official document of the Security Council, the text of which I shall read:

[*The speaker read the text of the note contained in document S/16084.*]

404. I should like to add on behalf of my Government that Brazil continues to follow closely the present developments in Grenada. We hope that every effort will be made to achieve a satisfactory settlement of that situation, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to which we are all committed and which we are all bound to respect. We renew our appeal for an honest and effective political effort and hope that it will meet with a response. Brazil wishes to see the people of Grenada assured of the free exercise of their right of self-determination.

405. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Singapore. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

406. Mr. KOH (Singapore): My country, Singapore, is one of the smallest States Members of the United Nations. It is a militarily weak State. Because we are small and because we are militarily weak, we therefore have a major stake in the efficacy of international law, in the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and in the United Nations collective security system. It is because our national security is threatened whenever a small or militarily weak State falls victim to aggression, intervention and interference by a bigger or militarily more powerful State that Singapore has been so outspoken in defence of the fundamental principles of the Charter. We believe that all small and militarily weak States share with us the same interest in protecting these principles, which afford us a degree of protection in a world which is all too prone to violence.

407. It is easy enough for us to demonstrate our adherence to principle when to do so is convenient and advantageous and costs us nothing. The test of a country's adherence to principle comes when such adherence is inconvenient. I find myself in such a situation today. Barbados, Jamaica, the United States, and the member States of the OECS are friends of my country. It would be extremely convenient for me to acquiesce in what they have done or to remain silent. To do so, however, would, in the long run, undermine the moral and legal significance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which my country regards as a shield. This is why we must put our adherence to principle above friendship. This is why we cannot condone the action of our friends in Grenada. The stand which my country has taken in this case is consistent with the stand which we have taken in other cases where the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States was also violated.

408. I regret that I shall have to say that some of the countries which have been clamouring the loudest for the condemnation of the foreign intervention in Grenada have not demonstrated their adherence to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States in other cases. Le me cite just one example. In December 1979, the Soviet Union committed aggression against Afghanistan. Soviet troops are in occupation of that country today, and the number of Afghans who are killed every day in resisting Soviet occupation is probably larger than that of all the casualties suffered in Grenada.

409. On 29 November 1982, the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session adopted its resolution 37/37 on Afghanistan. Which countries voted with the Soviet Union against that resolution? They included: Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Laos, Libya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Syria, the Ukraine and Viet Nam. By their support for the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan those 18 countries have clearly shown that they owe no allegiance to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. The real motive for their opposition to the action of the United States and others in Grenada is based not upon principle, but upon the fact that those who have violated the principle are their ideological adversaries, and those who are the victims of foreign intervention are their ideological comrades. The world should not be deceived by the opportunism and hypocrisy of those countries.

410. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I shall now make a statement as the representative of JORDAN.

411. Jordan is following events in Grenada with profound concern. The invasion and the violence that preceded it are evidence of the deteriorating and dangerous condition of international peace and security. These events also highlight the weakness of the Security Council. We have noted of late that there are those who disregard the United Nations because they have no faith in its ability, or because they feel that they have sufficient strength and power to do so. This is becoming common among States.

412. The invasion of Grenada is a violation of the principles of the Charter and of the rules of international law, in particular in respect of the non-use or threat of use of force and of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States. We cannot accept the occupation of an independent State, a Member of the United Nations, under any pretext whatsoever. No one has drawn the attention of the Security Council to a threat from Grenada to the security of any neighbouring or distant country. We do not agree with the attempts by some to intervene in the internal affairs of States and peoples on social or ideological grounds. As we condemn the invasion of Grenada, carried out under security and moral pretexts, we reject any further attempts to exploit social differences between States or peoples to achieve any ideological gains or to expand spheres of influence. The inability to influence a situation cannot justify invasion or the use of force. We cannot accept invasion and occupation under the pretext that such and such a party has the intention to commit aggression. If we were to accept that as a justification for an invasion, then any party could invade another, and our world would become like Hobbes's world—that is, a world in which everyone would be at war with everyone else.

413. An assessment as to whether there is a threat by one party against another cannot be made outside the international body that has responsibility for the maintenance of

international peace and security. Likewise, the right to self-defence does not imply the right to carry out preventive actions or to invade and occupy other countries. The States that invaded Grenada a few days ago had not notified this Council of any threat to their security by Grenada. Moreover, the safeguarding of civilians in a country where a war and military operations are under way is the responsibility of the International Committee of the Red Cross. An assessment as to whether there is a threat to international peace and security is the responsibility of the Security Council alone, under Article 34 of the Charter. Under Article 53, the regional organizations and agencies cannot play a role in dealing with any threat to international peace and security except on the request of the Security Council and under its auspices.

414. We feel that the military activities against Grenada are in contradiction to the principles of the Charter and constitute a grave danger, for it could serve as a precedent to be invoked to justify similar occupation operations in the future.

415. This invasion resembles Israeli military operations in the Middle East—in other words, invade first and then look for the justification. This invasion is reminiscent of certain invasions carried out by a certain country to ensure that the situation in neighbouring regions conforms to its strategic interests. This ends up by preventing countries and peoples from exercising their right to self-determination.

416. In conclusion, I should like to recall that the Foreign Minister of my country, at the 19th meeting of the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, that one of the reasons for the present tension in the international situation is that some regulate their national interests in a manner that is not clearly defined and on an ideological or moral basis, and then exploit what they have seized by military strength to serve those interests. The invasion of Grenada and what has followed it furnishes clear proof of this.

417. I now resume my capacity as PRESIDENT.

418. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution calling for a halt to this unceremonious high-handedness in international affairs, a halt to the military intervention by the United States.

419. During the Council's debate we have seen more clearly than ever the great gulf between those who aspire to be the supreme arbiter of the fate of the world and all those who truly hold dear the ideals of freedom, independence and sovereign existence. In the Council chamber we have heard virtually not one voice raised to justify the military intervention, the flagrant interference by Washington in the internal affairs of sovereign Grenada. The exceptions were only such countries as Saint Lucia, Dominica, the United Kingdom and Antigua and Barbuda.

420. The international community has received further proof as to what a gulf there is between talk about "loving peace" and "morality" and the actual deeds of those who determine United States policy in international affairs. Representatives here still have fresh in their memory the following words solemnly spoken in this Council by the United States representative on 25 March this year: "The United States indeed has no intention of invading anyone or of conducting an armed action against anyone, or of occupying any other country." [*See 2423rd meeting, para. 168.*] Lofty phrases about non-aggression, freedom and democracy pours forth in endless waves on us here in the Council, and also directly from the American capital. However, "non-aggression" as Washington understands it means intervention in the Dominican Republic, in Cuba and in other parts of the world; it means armed intervention in the affairs of Nicaragua. It is clear that by United States standards "democracy" applies only to those fascist dictator régimes in Chile, El Salvador or racist South Africa. That is why those régimes enjoy unconditional support from the White House, which simply closes its eyes to the torture of political detainees, to terrorism and to the activities of "death squads".

421. We feel we must also say a few words in connection with today's statements by the President of the United States and the United States representative in the Security Council.

422. As the Council knows, Mr. Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, said the following in his statement on 28 September this year [*S/16017, annex*]:

> "Even if someone had any illusions as to the possibility of a turn for the better in the policy of the present American Administration, the latest developments have finally dispelled them. For the sake of its imperial ambitions, it goes so far that one begins to doubt whether Washington has any brakes at all preventing it from crossing the mark before which any sober-minded person must stop."

423. What has been said today on behalf of the United States by way of justification of the American military intervention against that small independent country boils down to the following—if we discard the unpardonable United States demagoguery: the United States is declaring that from now on it will regard as legal only those internal orders in any country that bear the stamp "Made in the United States". All other orders it considers could be undermined or overthrown. It is specifically to justify this openly imperialistic policy that the cynical statements that we have heard today have been made—statements alleging that the Charter of the United Nations permits the use of force and, above all, permits the use of force by the United States of America.

424. This point was quite correctly noted by, for example, Mr. Maksoud, the observer for the League of Arab States. The United States invasion of Grenada and those pathetic attempts to justify it show quite clearly that the

war machine of American imperialism is now going full steam ahead, and this in turn shows what a dangerous situation there would be if the United States were to attain military superiority in the world which is something to which it aspires. Fortunately, this will not be permitted.

425. At this very moment, as the Council meets here, blood is being shed in Grenada, and those American "freedom fighters" are resorting to mass terror and intimidation against the population of the island. The fact that behind this action there is an attempt to bring to power a régime obedient to the United States is not even being hidden now.

426. The Soviet Union strongly condemns the aggression against the Caribbean island State and terms it a crime against humanity. As was stated in the TASS statement published on 26 October this year, "The bandit-like attack on Grenada clearly shows the danger to peace and to the freedom of the peoples inherent in the policy that is being pursued in international affairs by the current American Administration." American action against Grenada and the flagrant military intervention in the internal affairs of Nicaragua and El Salvador are attempts by sword and blood-spilling to arrogate to itself the right to decide what internal and external policies should be pursued by independent States. Today's events in Grenada could at any moment turn into a tragedy for other peoples, and primarily those peoples that Washington so disdainfully calls the "pseudo-non-aligned".

427. The aggression unleashed by the current Administration in Washington against a small non-aligned State should not escape strong condemnation by those who hold dear the ideals of true independence, justice and the right of peoples to determine their own fate, and by those who oppose high-handedness and lawlessness in international relations.

428. The struggle against the aggression committed against Grenada will continue.

429. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): I had not intended to extend an already long and arduous day of work, but I had thought that our work was serious and that our purpose was to address genuine concern. After listening to the diatribe of the representative of the Soviet Union, I decided that I had best put aside my intention.

430. I would remind the representative of the Soviet Union that on 25 March, when the representative of the United States made the statement that he quoted, indeed, the United States did not intend to invade any country. On 25 October 1983, the United States did not intend to invade any country. On 25 October 1983, the United States, along with Barbados and Jamaica, acceded to the request of friends—of gravely, perilously threatened friends—who sought our assistance in helping to restore the freedoms of the people of Grenada and in helping to repel the threat so imminently perceived to themselves. The Soviet representative speaks, quoting his head of Government, of United States imperial goals. My country and my President have no imperial goals. We will, as we can, assist in the defence of freedom. As we are able, we will assist in the establishment and restoration of democratic institutions, particularly when they have been cruelly and violently destroyed. We will, as we are able, assist in helping peoples preserve and extend human rights. All of that constitutes the goals of my country and of my Government. That is a lasting commitment. I wish only to reaffirm it tonight.

431. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/16077/Rev.1

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

The result of the vote was 11 in favour, 1 against, and 3 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

432. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to make statements after the voting.

433. Mr. NGUAYILA MBELA KALANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): As we said on Wednesday in our statement to the Council [*2489th meeting*], Zaire deplores and rejects aggression, diktat, shows of strength and interference in the internal affairs of other States.

434. In this spirit and this logic we did not vote against the draft resolution, but by abstaining we wished to protect certain trends which, pursuant to certain alliances and ideologies, consist in individualizing the victims of condemnation instead of abiding by respect for and preservation of the principles of the Charter. In similar previous cases, when the Council, with the authority and competence vested in it under the Charter, should have discharged its duties as the statutory guardian of world peace, we have endeavoured, by concealing our divisions and impotence, to shift our responsibilities to other organs or to regional bodies. In other cases the Council has been incapable of condemning or calling for the troops of an aggressor to withdraw when circumstances so required.

435. Therefore our abstention today is a protest and an alarm signal, inviting the Council fully to discharge its duties. We hope that henceforth it will play its part and safeguard the security of small, poor and defenceless States such as ours.

436. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): My delegation, along with those of Nicaragua and Zimbabwe, submitted to the Council a draft resolution which, we were convinced, reflected well the feelings of indignation expressed in this forum and elsewhere at the recent invasion of Grenada. That draft resolution reflected what was overwhelmingly recognized as a necessary course of action by the Council in the circumstances, the need for an immediate cessation of the intervention, withdrawal of the invading forces and fullest respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Grenada.

437. The draft resolution was not adopted because of the negative vote of a permanent member, the United States of America. But the overwhelming majority of the States that participated in this debate have branded as illegal and immoral the action taken by the United States in Grenada. The sponsors of the draft resolution would like to say a special word of thanks to the delegations of China, France, Jordan, Malta, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Poland and the Soviet Union for placing themselves so squarely and unequivocally on the side of principle this evening.

438. We should also like to pay a tribute to those Governments whose delegations have not spoken in the debate but which have also made statements, whether formal or otherwise, often condemning but in every case certainly rejecting the invasion of Grenada as a violation of international law. I refer, for example, to the Governments of Belize, the Bahamas, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Sweden. I refer to the Council of Europe, which declared that public opinion would find it hard to reconcile the invasion with the principles of international law.

439. We are all aware, on the basis of information coming out of Washington, that the majority of delegates to the OAS condemned the invasion of Grenada as a violation of international law and the principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States.

440. Stansfield Turner, former director of the American Central Intelligence Agency, said on Monday that Grenada was so small that it could not even be found on the map and that as a military force Grenada did not even figure on the list. Yet Grenada was not too small for the military might of a super-Power to be unleashed against it complete with reinforcements, including additional helicopter gunships which, we heard this morning, were being dispatched to that territory.

441. The use of such armaments must undoubtedly be causing tremendous suffering and death in Grenada. Yet in the course of the reporting during the week on events taking place there, does anyone remember reading or hearing anything about Grenadian casualties? We hear about American casualties and Cuban casualties, but are we to assume that there have been no Grenadian casualties, whether of a civilian nature or among the armed forces? Our concern in this regard is all the greater when we recall that there has been and continues to be a complete news blackout by the occupying authorities. My delegation is very concerned, and genuinely so, about the fate of the people of Grenada under the guns of the occupying forces, and we hope that we will soon be allowed to learn of their welfare.

442. Far beyond the immediate issue we have been discussing this week, I fear that if this week's events were to become practice we should be entering into a new dark age in relations between States in which the use of force is given precedence over dialogue, military solutions take priority over political solutions, and in which even small States whose methods of political or economic organization do not meet the standards of acceptability set by their neighbours are now in danger of invasion to change the *status quo*. I say this not to be provocative or to cause offense. Guyana is a small State struggling to maintain and strengthen its national independence, a State which sees respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations as the surest guarantee and protection of its independence. It is therefore with deep concern and in great sorrow and anger that we have been following the events in Grenada.

443. If States in any region can invite outside forces to intervene in a country whose policies and performance displease them, we all stand threatened. This week it is Grenada. Who will it be tomorrow? For whom do the bells now toll?

444. When a number of States combine to invite an outside Power to intervene illegally in a neighbouring State, trampling underfoot the sovereignty and independence of that State, they are also diminishing their own sovereignty in the process. Let us make no mistake about that. The intervening Power will not apply one standard in its relations with the victim State and another in its relations with the inviting States. It will apply against the latter the same standards on the basis of which they invited its intervention. What they are doing is in effect pledging their own compliance with those standards, thereby diminishing their own sovereignty. Did Caribbean States gain their hard-earned independence in order to resubmit to a new colonialism or to set ourselves up as a new breed of latter-day imperialists? There is no room for that in the Caribbean.

445. In this regard we noted with close attention and much interest the statement by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago this evening in his capacity as representative of his Government—he also happens to be current Chairman of CARICOM—on the deliberations of the twelve Caribbean heads of State invited to Trinidad last weekend. His report is critical to our assessment of the tragic events in Grenada, for those who invaded Grenada invoked the holy mantle of the sub-regional eastern Caribbean grouping. But all of the invading States—except the United States or course, and encompassing more than the eastern Caribbean in the form of Barbados and Jamaica—belong to CARICOM and participated in that consultation last weekend.

446. We have heard of the deep concern and the need expressed to seek a peaceful, diplomatic, regional solution. The proposals agreed on by CARICOM States were

designed to achieve a return to normality, the maintenance of peace through a CARICOM peace-keeping force and the establishment of a broad-based national Government. The CARICOM proposals were precisely designed to meet the objectives of those who in invading Grenada were so proudly carrying the banner of democracy. These concerns would have been fully met if the CARICOM proposals had been implemented by them. They were set aside by the OECS and other States because they lacked that element which would have satisfied the desire for suppression of Grenada's independence and sovereignty and thus the creation of an opportunity to impose a form of government suitable and acceptable to those who, by their own admission, had only tolerated the Bishop Government. The desire to purge Grenada of unacceptable forces had to be satisfied.

447. The American veto notwithstanding, or perhaps the veto does underscore, there is a compelling need for us to be very emphatic that we shall never condone intervention and interference; we shall never condone the violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a State. We shall never forsake the Charter.

448. The events in Grenada this week and the outcome of the debate this evening show the clear need for that great majority of States which still see value in the Charter and in international relations based on the rule of law to redouble our efforts to ensure that respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity shall never perish from the face of the earth.

The meeting rose on Friday, 28 October, at 3.05 a.m.

NOTES

[1] General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), annex.

[2] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, Vol. I, 5th meeting, para. 140.

[3] General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX).

[4] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, Vol. I, 19th meeting, para. 21.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00600 90-60205—August 1992—2,050